

TOWNSHIP OF LONG HILL
PLANNING BOARD

-----x

IN THE MATTER OF:

Application No. 19-13P	TRANSCRIPT
PRISM MILLINGTON, LLC	OF
50 Division Avenue	
Blocks 12301/10100 Lots 1/7.01	PROCEEDINGS
Major Preliminary and Final	
Site Plan	

-----x

Tuesday, September 22, 2020
Zoom Remote Hearing
Commencing at 8:17 p.m.

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

DAVID HANDS, Chairman
THOMAS JONES, Vice Chairman
BRENDAN RAE, Mayor
JOHN FALVEY
VICTOR VERLEZZA
TOM MALINOUSKY
J. ALAN PFEIL
DENNIS SANDOW

A P P E A R A N C E S

JOLANTA MAZIARZ, ESQUIRE
Attorney for the Board

DECOTIIS, FITZPATRICK, COLE & GIBLIN, LLP
BY: FRANCIS REGAN, ESQUIRE
Attorneys for the Applicant

PRECISION REPORTING SERVICE
Certified Shorthand Reporters
(908) 642-4299

1 A L S O P R E S E N T :

2 DEBRA COONCE, Planning & Zoning Board
 Coordinator

3
4 ELIZABETH LEHENY, Township Planner

5 MICHAEL LANZAFAMA, Board Engineer

6 ROBERT FOURNIADIS (Previously sworn)

7 PAUL DeVITTO (Previously sworn)

8 MATTHEW SECKLER (Previously sworn)

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

TABLE OF CONTENTS

WITNESS:		PAGE
ANGELO ALBERTO		
Examination by Mr. Regan		13
Examination by the Board		21
Examination by the Board		32
JEFFREY MARTELL		
Examination by Mr. Regan		103
Examination by the Board		109

NUMBER	EXHIBITS DESCRIPTION	PAGE
A-10	Revised Proposed Retail Rendering	8
A-11	Waste and Recycling Receptacle Study	19

1 CHAIRMAN HANDS: Okay. So now we
2 move on to Item Number 9, which is the
3 continuation of the, for want of a better
4 word, the Prism application at the Tifa site.

5 At least from my recollection, we
6 stopped --

7 BOARD MEMBER RICHARDSON: I bid you
8 farewell. Have a good evening.

9 CHAIRMAN HANDS: Tom. Tom. Tom,
10 thank you.

11 BOARD MEMBER MALINOUSKY: Take care.

12 CHAIRMAN HANDS: Take care.

13 BOARD MEMBER RICHARDSON: Bye-bye,
14 Tom.

15 CHAIRMAN HANDS: Thank you.

16 By my recollection we left off, I
17 think it was the architect. And we had two
18 people that we did not get to: Terry
19 Carruthers and Mary Lou Zivos.

20 BOARD MEMBER SANDOW: Excuse me,
21 Mr. Chairman, and Vick. Did you want to talk
22 about Victor's certification?

23 CHAIRMAN HANDS: Say again.

24 COORDINATOR COONCE: The fact that
25 Victor is rejoining us. He was not -- he was

1 not present at the last meeting.

2 MS. MAZIARZ: Oh, yes. Committeeman
3 Verlezza has certified that he has listened to
4 the previous hearing and he is prepared to
5 resume his role on the Planning Board this
6 evening.

7 Correct, Mr. Verlezza?

8 BOARD MEMBER VERLEZZA: Correct.

9 COORDINATOR COONCE: Okay. Very
10 good.

11 MS. MAZIARZ: And we will have a
12 document that Mr. Verlezza will sign and that
13 I will sign that will indicate that he has
14 listened to the videotape of the last hearing.
15 And that will be made a part of this record.

16 COORDINATOR COONCE: Yes. And,
17 Mr. Chairman, would you like me to note the
18 additional documents from Prism as an
19 applicant that went up on the website this
20 afternoon?

21 CHAIRMAN HANDS: Yeah. I just
22 wanted to finish my comment, but --

23 COORDINATOR COONCE: Oh, sorry.

24 CHAIRMAN HANDS: That's fine. We'll
25 get to that in a minute. I just want to

1 continue on from where we left off before we
2 then go off to catch ourselves up to today and
3 then a continuation on.

4 So I just want to be -- from my
5 records, we had two people left with hands up,
6 I think, on the architect. And I'd like to
7 make sure that they -- I see Terry Carruthers
8 is here. And Mary Lou? I don't see Mary Lou
9 on the attendees list unless Mary Lou is under
10 a different name.

11 Please, if you are, just raise your
12 hand as well.

13 And I wanted also just to
14 double-check that -- if Don Farnell -- I see
15 he's on the list here.

16 Don, if you can hear me, if you
17 don't mind just double-checking, you can raise
18 your hand when you have a second. I just want
19 to make sure that the mechanics are working,
20 that you can raise your hand.

21 And just to be clear to everybody, I
22 think we said, you know, Deb and I control the
23 attendees, or at least can see the attendees
24 list. We probably have 35 attendees. Three
25 folks, Terry, Dorothy and -- let's see. I see

1 Chuck. Three people do have their hands up
2 right now. I think that will be a
3 continuation on the -- at least in my mind a
4 continuation from where we left off last time.
5 So we'll come back to the hands up in a
6 second.

7 I just wanted to make sure it's
8 clear that Deb and I are the ones that can see
9 the attendees' hands up. And I think we
10 should try to be very clear, Deb, as we go
11 through this when we do see people and do not
12 see people with hands up.

13 If anybody does -- I know we've said
14 this before. If anybody does not -- if we do
15 not mention your name and you believe you have
16 your hand up, kind of wave the computer around
17 or something or e-mail me certainly or Deb so
18 we know there may be a mechanical reason or a
19 technical reason why --

20 COORDINATOR COONCE: I check my -- I
21 check my work e-mail frequently during the
22 call -- during the meeting.

23 CHAIRMAN HANDS: Thank you. Don't
24 use mine, use Deb's. If there's any issues
25 that you're not connected, but you do want to

1 raise a question, e-mail Deb in real time and
2 we can look at that.

3 Having said all that, I just wanted
4 to catch up from last time, and we'll pick up
5 from there perhaps in a few minutes.

6 But, yeah, since then, Deb, we've
7 had a few documents posted, et cetera. If
8 you'd like just to go through that.

9 COORDINATOR COONCE: Yes. So the
10 first one we received last Friday was what I
11 labeled inadvertently as Exhibit A-9, revised
12 proposed retail rendering. It was dated 9/18
13 and uploaded today. That I will have to
14 relabel as Exhibit A-10, Mr. Regan, because I
15 forgot about the soil movement plan that was
16 previously labeled Exhibit A-9.

17 MR. REGAN: Okay. Fine.

18 COORDINATOR COONCE: Any objection?
19 Okay. So that was the first.

20 Then our Board engineer,
21 Mr. Lanzafama, sent us a revision to their
22 report, which Mr. Lanzafama can speak to if he
23 wishes.

24 Mr. Lanzafama, do you have any notes
25 on that report that you sent me yesterday and

1 I posted today?

2 MR. LANZAFAMA: Yeah. I distributed
3 to you and also sent it directly to the
4 applicant's engineer. So they are privy to
5 it.

6 We've also had a phone conversation
7 with some of their staff with regard to the
8 landscaping. And we can get into that later
9 on or, you know, it's up to the Chairman how
10 he wants to proceed.

11 COORDINATOR COONCE: Great. The
12 transcript from August 18th has been posted.
13 And last, but not least, we had some previous
14 testimony to the architect from Bill Kaufman
15 of Millington and he had submitted a proposed
16 public exhibit. So that has also been posted
17 under the public exhibits for testimony.

18 And those are the updates. Unless
19 I've missed anything, Mr. Regan, and
20 Mr. Fourniadis, I think we're current.

21 MR. REGAN: I think that's correct.

22 CHAIRMAN HANDS: Just as a matter of
23 interest, how are we going to handle, say,
24 Bill's documents? Is he -- is that saved for
25 a future time or when Bill can introduce them?

1 I see Bill is on the attendee list.

2 COORDINATOR COONCE: That's up to
3 the Board, honestly, if you're going to be
4 accepting of his exhibits when it's his turn
5 to testify.

6 MS. MAZIARZ: Right. But he has to
7 be there to testify and to tell you what it is
8 that he is providing and why.

9 CHAIRMAN HANDS: Okay.

10 COORDINATOR COONCE: And to my
11 knowledge, we're not at testimony yet. We're
12 still in the question process.

13 CHAIRMAN HANDS: Well, I see --

14 COORDINATOR COONCE: We haven't
15 begun public testimony.

16 CHAIRMAN HANDS: Right now we're
17 still questioning, not providing public
18 comment for testimony purposes at this point.

19 COORDINATOR COONCE: Correct.

20 CHAIRMAN HANDS: Okay. Great.
21 Thank you.

22 Unless there's any other questions,
23 can I hand it over to Frank, maybe, or Bob?

24 MR. REGAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I
25 think you're accurate that I think there was

1 some remaining questions from our architect,
2 Angelo Alberto. He has also, as Deb
3 mentioned, provided -- we took the opportunity
4 to -- or Bob directed him -- Bob Fourniadis
5 directed Angelo to prepare some revisions to
6 the retail building. So I'd like to have
7 Angelo go through those, you know, after the
8 questions or before. That's up to you.

9 I know that we have our engineer and
10 I don't know the most efficient way to handle
11 the revisions that were submitted back at the
12 end of August. I know the Board engineer has
13 addressed those in his memo and it may be more
14 efficient to have him go through his memo and
15 have Jeff Martell from Stonefield, you know,
16 respond to any of it. We're prepared to have
17 Jeff come back and explain, you know, the
18 amendments that were done to the site plans,
19 the landscape plans, the lighting plans after
20 the architect.

21 CHAIRMAN HANDS: Yeah, fine. I'm
22 just wondering if we just maybe just put up
23 the architect first to have a look at the
24 updated suggestions to the retail building,
25 whether that would be appropriate before we

1 head into public questions.

2 MR. REGAN: That's fine,
3 Mr. Chairman. I don't have a problem with
4 that. In addition to that, I know there was a
5 question or a comment in the Board engineer's
6 memo with regards to garbage; you know, where
7 the garbage cans or refuse area would be in
8 each building for the two units that don't
9 have -- two units, I guess, on each side that
10 don't have a garage. So he was going to be
11 prepared to address that also.

12 CHAIRMAN HANDS: Okay. Why don't we
13 just do that unless anybody disagrees. Why
14 don't we just finish off that, circle back to
15 those professionals on your side. I see
16 Terry, Dorothy, Chuck. If you can bear with
17 us a few more minutes, it may just help
18 provide a bit more information that may or may
19 not address your questions.

20 MR. REGAN: Okay. That's perfectly
21 fine.

22 Angelo, if you can -- you heard what
23 I suggested to the Chairman. So if you can --
24 whatever item you want to address first,
25 whether it be the refuse storage in the

1 buildings or the retail building. Your call.

2 A N G E L O A L B E R T O, having
3 been previously duly sworn, remained under
4 oath and testified as follows:

5 THE WITNESS: Okay. Thanks, Frank.
6 Thank you, Board. I'll share my screen if
7 that's okay.

8 MS. MAZIARZ: Mr. Alberto, before
9 you proceed, you acknowledge that you are
10 still under oath?

11 THE WITNESS: Yes.

12 MS. MAZIARZ: Thank you.

13 THE WITNESS: Okay. I'm going to
14 share my screen now.

15 CHAIRMAN HANDS: That doesn't look
16 like a building. Maybe a statue.

17 THE WITNESS: This -- so we're
18 oriented, this is the retail building that we
19 presented last meeting. And in the notes we
20 had said that we were trying -- our
21 architectural approach for this retail was to
22 transition the more traditional elements of
23 the town into what we would call a more
24 contemporary styling. And so we were taking
25 the materials and the colors from the project

1 and trying to do something that -- you know,
2 you'll see this in some retail centers.

3 There was a number of comments from
4 the community. And my client, Bob Fourniadis
5 from Prism, said, Well, we'll consider looking
6 at the retail. You know, revisiting the
7 retail design.

8 So we did not change the footprint.
9 It's still this 4,000-square-foot footprint,
10 but I'm going to transition now to the next
11 slide here. This is what we submitted last
12 Friday.

13 So, again, you know, going to the
14 main part of the design and what we'll be
15 seeing the most. This is the Division Avenue
16 elevation. So, again, we took the same
17 rhythm, the same footprint, essentially the
18 same materials. And we wanted to do something
19 that was more traditional. And we -- I did a
20 Google search of the town. I looked at the
21 nearby bank, the post office, some of the
22 residences around town.

23 And we're limited to a 20-foot
24 building height. So we would have had a very
25 shallow roof pitch, so we did this more --

1 you'll see this roof type. It's a little more
2 train stationesque, if you will, with the
3 lower pitch and then we were able to get a
4 higher pitch to make the roof appear higher.

5 But it does meet all of the
6 ordinance elements. So it's a 20-foot height.
7 Again, it's the 4,000-square-foot footprint.
8 The predominant material is brick. As opposed
9 to a flat roof in the prior concept, this has
10 a pitched roof, really like a double gable
11 pitched roof.

12 And we are, again, going in a more
13 traditional direction where we have moved the
14 entrance doors to the center of each bay.
15 We've centered the signage over that. And
16 then we're proposing a decorative shed dormer
17 over each bay.

18 So the architecture speaks for
19 itself. Again, we are not going for signage
20 approval, but we do create an elegant sign
21 band here that fits the architecture. And
22 we'll have downlights above illuminating that
23 in the evening.

24 One material that we did introduce
25 is a masonry base, which would be, again,

1 in -- the siding on the residences is this
2 earthy slate blue and we wanted to do an
3 earthy grayish base color. So that's
4 essentially the primary elevation.

5 I want to show that same elevation
6 from the other -- looking in the other
7 direction coming down Division Street because
8 a couple of comments were made about the
9 possibility of connecting the architecture
10 with the exterior space, be it an outdoor
11 plaza, perhaps dining, which, if it was
12 dining, we would probably have to come back
13 before the Board. We don't have tenants yet,
14 but we wanted to suggest this area that
15 overlooks the train station and New Jersey
16 Transit as a possible outdoor area. So we did
17 a little sketch with that.

18 We were also suggesting that, you
19 know, if we were to do something like that, we
20 would maybe suggest some more paving, no more
21 than 450 square feet, and that would
22 accommodate an outdoor plaza or possibly
23 another outdoor use.

24 So that's the Division Avenue
25 elevation. Just like the last design, this is

1 the rear, which faces internal to the project,
2 which also faces parking and it's across from
3 the clubhouse.

4 Again, there's less glazing on this
5 side. We're just suggesting here some what
6 they call blade signs coming off of the wall.
7 Again, we're not proposing a signage package,
8 but we have plenty of room in this area to put
9 signage on the simplified rear facade.

10 And we also wanted to express that
11 there were some questions last time about
12 condensers and heating condensers. And we're
13 proposing rooftop units. We haven't designed
14 the mechanical yet, but most likely -- we do a
15 fair amount of this retail -- the space breaks
16 down and it could be one large
17 4,000-square-foot space or break down into two
18 or three spaces. And that's reflected in the
19 number of entrances. And we created
20 essentially a 5-foot-deep-by-40-foot cutout in
21 the roof on the rear side for these rooftop
22 elements.

23 That's essentially it. The lower
24 roof overhang is 10 feet and the building
25 height will be somewhere near the maximum,

1 which is 20 feet.

2 CHAIRMAN HANDS: Thank you for that.

3 I appreciate the quick turnaround and some
4 accommodations to what we discussed. Thank
5 you for that.

6 THE WITNESS: You're very welcome.

7 The other graphic, which we did not
8 submit on Friday, but I wanted to illustrate,
9 this has been submitted previously and there
10 were some questions in the last meeting
11 regarding the ability for this trash enclosure
12 to accommodate the four units.

13 So if the Board and the audience
14 recalls, there's ten units in each building.
15 Each building has six garages. Those six
16 garages will have trash and recycling
17 receptacles. And that leaves four units that
18 have to have trash and recycling elsewhere.
19 And, again, we had testified that these are
20 accurate in terms of scale, in terms of
21 styling, but some of the details have not been
22 worked out.

23 So this -- this was a suggestion of
24 the trash enclosure. And we sharpened our
25 pencils a little bit and we did this sketch,

1 which is a fairly straightforward sketch.
2 Now, here you see the same side elevation and
3 we call this the waste and recycling
4 receptacle study.

5 Do we want to give this a number,
6 this graphic?

7 MR. REGAN: Deb, I think this would
8 be A-10 -- A-11.

9 THE WITNESS: A-11.

10 COORDINATOR COONCE: A-11.

11 (Whereupon, exhibit is received and
12 marked A-11 in evidence.)

13 COORDINATOR COONCE: If you can
14 just, yeah, e-mail that to me, then I can get
15 that up on the website.

16 THE WITNESS: Okay. Right. And,
17 again, this is an embellishment of a prior
18 elevation submitted. Essentially what we did
19 is we did some research and this 96-gallon
20 receptacle is very popular because it will
21 have private hauling off of this site. And
22 this -- everyone's seen this with this bar
23 and there's an arm that comes out and dumps
24 the trash or the recycling into a hauling
25 truck.

1 So this common receptacle, we looked
2 at it. The dimensions are 30 inches wide,
3 which is the key dimension, 35 and 1/2 inches
4 deep, and 43 and 1/2 inches high.

5 And we calculated, based on
6 information on Waste Management's website,
7 that each of these receptacles holds
8 approximately five to seven trash bags. And
9 we propose to have six of these total cans,
10 waste cans, be able to serve four total units.
11 Of the six, four would be for trash, two for
12 recycling. And because of the nature of the
13 design, three of these receptacles would be on
14 one side -- two trash, one recycling -- and
15 three receptacles on the other symmetrical
16 end.

17 So we then projected in scale this
18 30-inch-wide receptacle and we left
19 approximately 6 to 8 inches in between. And
20 we just did the math: 3 times 30, 6 to 8
21 inches in between, and 6 inches of structure,
22 you know, essentially the wood that would
23 enclose this, and that came out to be 10
24 feet.

25 So if you go back to this drawing,

1 it's somewhat wider, but this is, you know,
2 how an architectural plan develops. This one
3 is more accommodating, probably more accurate.
4 And we still have a remain -- we have 8 foot 8
5 remaining. In this sketch, we have 4 foot on
6 this side and 4 foot 8 on that side.

7 So, again, as I testified last
8 month, there's plenty of room here to
9 accommodate these trash receptacles. And with
10 the, you know, fair amount of research that we
11 did, we're confident that two trash cans, one
12 recyclable -- recycle can, and the same
13 repeated on the other side, will accommodate
14 the four units.

15 MR. LANZAFAMA: Mr. Alberto, just
16 one question: How far does that project
17 from the face of the building do you
18 anticipate?

19 THE WITNESS: The depth of these
20 cans is 35 and a half inches. So you would
21 probably add another 6 inches to that. So,
22 you know, maybe 42, which is 3 foot 6.

23 MR. LANZAFAMA: Okay.

24 THE WITNESS: Which is similar to
25 what was in the original sketch.

1 MR. LANZAFAMA: Okay. For a moment,
2 just can you go back to your site plan and
3 show us where these receptacles are located?

4 THE WITNESS: Yes. You see these
5 projections on the building? Each building
6 has four projections.

7 MR. LANZAFAMA: Mm-hmm.

8 THE WITNESS: And it's probably
9 easier to see on the ground floor plan. This
10 is the ground floor plan. One of these -- two
11 of these are enclosed with doors: One will be
12 the sprinkler room; one will have the electric
13 meters. And then what you see here -- here
14 you see, again, a preliminary sketch of the
15 trash enclosure.

16 MR. LANZAFAMA: So that would be
17 somewhat larger based upon your testimony you
18 just presented.

19 THE WITNESS: Right. It most likely
20 will not project out more. We can actually
21 see the number.

22 MR. LANZAFAMA: Just longer.

23 THE WITNESS: Yeah. It will be
24 wider, yes.

25 MR. LANZAFAMA: Now, where are these

1 cans placed -- if you're having a company come
2 in that has automated pickup, where are those
3 cans when they come by to grab them and dump
4 them into their hauling facility?

5 THE WITNESS: Well, we're going to
6 have a private hauler. And I'm not really an
7 expert in this, but my guess is, is that
8 someone -- you know, certainly the homeowners
9 in the six garages will wheel their cans out
10 to the street and these cans would have to be
11 wheeled out to the street; or maybe you have a
12 private hauler who walks up, undoes the latch,
13 opens the door and takes them out.

14 So I'm not sure. Maybe
15 Mr. Fourniadis has more experience with this.

16 MR. LANZAFAMA: The reason I bring
17 this up is if you go back to the site plan and
18 you look at the location of the trash
19 receptacles relative to the parking, it looks
20 to me like you may have some conflicts with
21 the available parking.

22 And then are you indicating that
23 trash cans are going to be sitting out on the
24 sidewalk for some period of time or is the
25 private carting firm, as you said, going to go

1 in and grab those containers and take them
2 out?

3 R O B E R T F O U R N I A D I S,
4 having been previously duly sworn, remained
5 under oath and testified as follows:

6 MR. FOURNIADIS: Well, if I -- if I
7 could respond to that. Again, we'd have to
8 see. There are areas where the trash cans
9 could be brought to the curb. And when we are
10 negotiating to bring a hauler in here, if the
11 only solution is that the hauler has to go in
12 and bring the cans out, dump them and then
13 bring them back, that's what we'll do.

14 MR. LANZAFAMA: Okay. Because
15 there -- you know, as you said, there are
16 areas where that seems to work very well.
17 There are other areas where it doesn't work
18 very well. So you're going to have to work
19 that out with the hauling firm, I would
20 assume.

21 MR. FOURNIADIS: Right. And the
22 good thing about this, as opposed to a
23 condominium where, you know, everybody's left
24 to their own devices, here you'll have an
25 owner, which is us. You'll have a management

1 company, one person making the arrangements
2 for all of the buildings. So it will work --
3 it will work without a hitch.

4 MR. LANZAFAMA: So your -- so your
5 on-site staff or the staff that manages the
6 facility, would they take the burden of
7 getting the trash cans out at the appropriate
8 time if the hauling firm does not wish to do
9 that?

10 MR. FOURNIADIS: Yes. We will
11 have -- we may not have an on-site porter all
12 the time, but we will have management people,
13 as we do for the various sites that we have
14 right now. And it could be arranged that they
15 would be at the property on garbage day. And
16 we would know when that is because that would
17 be pursuant to our agreement with the waste
18 hauler.

19 MR. LANZAFAMA: All right.

20 MR. FOURNIADIS: On the days that
21 they're going to be there, our porter would be
22 there to make sure the cans make it to the
23 curb and make sure the cans make it back
24 inside the enclosure.

25 MR. LANZAFAMA: That would be the

1 perfect solution in my mind.

2 MR. FOURNIADIS: We have a similar
3 situation in another project right now where
4 we went through the same thing there. We had
5 dumpsters in the building. They were much
6 bigger buildings than these. And the porter
7 there, the plan is they'll pull up the door,
8 wheel the dumpster out, hits the trunk, wheel
9 it back. This is much, much simpler.

10 MR. LANZAFAMA: Okay. Thank you.

11 MR. REGAN: I have -- Angelo,
12 nothing further, right?

13 THE WITNESS: No, that's it.

14 MR. REGAN: Okay. We have nothing
15 further. I have no further testimony from
16 Mr. Alberto, Mr. Chairman.

17 CHAIRMAN HANDS: Thank you for that.

18 With that then said, unless there's
19 any comments on the last couple of exhibits or
20 discussions from the Board, we'll go back to
21 the public.

22 MS. LEHENY: Can I actually just ask
23 a quick question?

24 MR. REGAN: Sure.

25 MS. LEHENY: How are you -- is there

1 a way that you could shield the mechanicals
2 that are facing sort of in the development on
3 the retail building?

4 THE WITNESS: Yeah. I'm sorry. Let
5 me just pull that up.

6 BOARD MEMBER PFEIL: There you go.

7 THE WITNESS: Right. So you're
8 talking about some kind of screening element
9 here?

10 MS. LEHENY: Yeah. I'm just curious
11 if that would be possible in some way.

12 THE WITNESS: It's certainly
13 possible. It makes it a little more
14 challenging when you have maintenance and
15 things like that. But if that's the will of
16 the Board and Prism is accommodating to that,
17 you know, we can certainly --

18 MR. FOURNIADIS: That's fine. We
19 have to design something. That's easily
20 doable, Angelo. I'm fine with that.

21 THE WITNESS: Okay.

22 MS. LEHENY: All right. Thank you.

23 CHAIRMAN HANDS: Thank you. Okay.

24 With that then said, let's --

25 BOARD MEMBER MALINOUSKY: Another

1 quick question about the retail building. On
2 the north end view, if you do have a
3 restaurant or diner in there, would you be
4 able to put a door at the northern end to
5 access the patio?

6 THE WITNESS: Oh, yes. Yes. So you
7 have basically three door wide triple, you
8 know, glass areas. So one or more of those
9 would be doors.

10 BOARD MEMBER MALINOUSKY: Okay. And
11 then along the Division Avenue, are the lights
12 now -- are the wall lights now replaced with
13 bollard lights? Is that what I'm seeing?

14 THE WITNESS: Yeah. I do apologize
15 to the Board. I did notice that bollards were
16 put in here. That's not necessary. I think
17 it was a little bit of an artistic touch by
18 the person and it slipped by me.

19 We will -- we are showing here
20 almost like double signage with these blade
21 signs and this sign panel. We probably would
22 do one or the other, depending on what the
23 Board wanted. But the prior design had lights
24 on the wall here. I'm not sure we'd do
25 bollards.

1 BOARD MEMBER MALINOUSKY: Okay.

2 Thank you.

3 MR. FOURNIADIS: Yeah, I think
4 bollards would impede the flow of people
5 walking.

6 BOARD MEMBER MALINOUSKY: Right.

7 MR. FOURNIADIS: I think we'd put
8 them on the wall because there's also going to
9 be street lights here.

10 BOARD MEMBER MALINOUSKY: Right.

11 That's an error.

12 CHAIRMAN HANDS: Okay. Might as
13 well do this.

14 Adam, anybody else on the Board,
15 what's your first reaction to this revised?

16 BOARD MEMBER PFEIL: Lot better.

17 VICE CHAIRMAN JONES: Yeah,
18 definitely a step in the right direction. I
19 can kind of start to see it harmonizing with
20 the train station. So I start to see those
21 elements in this rendition.

22 BOARD MEMBER PFEIL: I was impressed
23 with the speed in which this was done, too.
24 Angelo, much appreciated.

25 THE WITNESS: Thank you.

1 CHAIRMAN HANDS: I agree with the
2 Board. Just one minor thing for me would be
3 if there's -- there's overkill here. But
4 maybe a bit more tie-in to the train station,
5 which has columns, but that maybe is faux
6 columns. It would be nice to be able to feel
7 that building is a little bit more in tune,
8 and it's definitely on the right path, a
9 little bit more in tune with the train
10 station.

11 MR. FOURNIADIS: Well, this is a --
12 this is a concept plan. And as I had
13 previously volunteered when we presented the
14 building that everybody hated, we'd be willing
15 to, you know, have as a continuing condition
16 to come back and, you know, put some elements
17 in here.

18 You know, we flipped a coin: Do we
19 want it to look more like the train station or
20 more like Millington Bank, not Kearny Bank,
21 and the post office? And it came up tails so
22 we went with the bank and the post office and,
23 you know, that's how these things work out.

24 But we did want the wide eave all
25 the way around and the dormers because that is

1 reminiscent of a train station.

2 And as one of the members of the
3 public mentioned last time -- and that's why
4 Angelo and I went to work on this -- that they
5 saw the retail building in our Dunellen job
6 which also, you know, resembled a train
7 station and that's why we came back with this.

8 CHAIRMAN HANDS: I greatly
9 appreciate it. I think it's certainly getting
10 much, much closer and I appreciate the outside
11 area as well. That ties in quite well,
12 actually.

13 VICE CHAIRMAN JONES: And one final
14 comment from my side, Mr. Chairman.

15 And thank you, Mr. Fourniadis. I
16 like the fact on the north end and the south
17 end that you've added more glazing to create
18 more open airiness and not just a wall. I
19 thank you for that.

20 THE WITNESS: Yes. I should have
21 pointed that out. We did that on both ends.

22 VICE CHAIRMAN JONES: Thank you.

23 CHAIRMAN HANDS: Thank you.

24 Okay. Deb, do you want to swing
25 over to -- I think Terry's first up on the --

1 COORDINATOR COONCE: Yep. So Terry
2 Carruthers. Here we go.

3 Terry, you're muted. Okay.

4 MR. CARRUTHERS: Okay. There I am.

5 Good evening, Chairman, ladies and
6 gentlemen.

7 Firstly, David, I believe that
8 Dorothy Smullen has a time restriction. So
9 could I -- could I offer her the first place
10 to speak?

11 CHAIRMAN HANDS: Please.

12 Absolutely.

13 MR. CARRUTHERS: Okay. So I'll
14 stand down and I'll...

15 CHAIRMAN HANDS: Dorothy, can you --

16 MR. FOURNIADIS: Debra, you're
17 muted.

18 COORDINATOR COONCE: Sorry.

19 Dorothy, are you there?

20 MS. SMULLEN: Yes. You can hear me?

21 CHAIRMAN HANDS: Yes.

22 MS. SMULLEN: Hi. My name is
23 Dorothy Smullen. I live at 141 River Road in
24 Millington, just a stone throw from the end of
25 the development. I've lived in town for 51

1 years. And perhaps this is not the right time
2 for this particular question, but the site
3 plan shows two exits for the traffic. And one
4 is on Stone House Road, one is on Division
5 Avenue.

6 Living on River Road for this time,
7 I've seen a lot of changes. Ever since
8 terrible storms and people have GPS and they
9 use that GPS to figure out shortcuts, River
10 Road is just very busy in the rush hour
11 traffic. And this, of course, is before the
12 virus. But, so, I'm just concerned about the
13 traffic and the people coming out Stone House
14 heading toward Route 78 or possibly toward
15 Verizon, which means that they would come down
16 Stone House and then turn down Pond Hill in
17 Somerset County.

18 Sometimes when I'm heading off to
19 work, there's a line of 10 to 15 cars on Pond
20 Hill waiting to turn onto South Maple Avenue
21 ever since that big storm. So I just don't
22 know whether another exit maybe into the road
23 along the railroad road would be helpful to
24 alleviate some of the traffic.

25 CHAIRMAN HANDS: Well, we know

1 that's not an architectural question
2 necessarily, but are you able to -- do you
3 want just a quick response or not?

4 MR. REGAN: I know, Mr. Chairman, we
5 obviously had our civil engineer as well as
6 the traffic engineer testify a number of
7 hearings back with regards to, you know, the
8 access to and from the site as well as the
9 traffic generation. And I think based on that
10 testimony, you know, they believe that the two
11 exits and entrances -- you know, one off Stone
12 Hill and one off Division -- are more than
13 sufficient for the size of the development.
14 And a third one, you know, isn't necessary and
15 I think their testimony bore that out.

16 CHAIRMAN HANDS: Thank you.

17 MS. SMULLEN: Thank you.

18 CHAIRMAN HANDS: Thank you, Dorothy.

19 Did you have another question for
20 the architect or was your question
21 specifically on the traffic?

22 MS. SMULLEN: Just the traffic.

23 CHAIRMAN HANDS: Thank you very
24 much.

25 Terry, do you want to hop on to the

1 mic?

2 MR. CARRUTHERS: All right. So
3 thank you again, David.

4 So for the court reporter, my name
5 is Terry Carruthers. I'm former chair of the
6 Environmental Commission as of last night. I
7 stepped down for personal reasons.

8 But as I prepared the actual
9 document that's posted on the Planning Board
10 website, I thought I should complete this and
11 follow through with the questions. When I
12 prepared it, I wasn't aware that this would be
13 divided into a question period and then a more
14 formal comment period. So I'm kind of
15 scrolling down through my comments to address
16 some of the questions that I ask.

17 And one of the questions I had was
18 referring to the scale of the maps that were
19 presented. For example, the graphic scale on
20 the demolition plan C-3 was incorrect. It
21 should have read 1 inch equals 40 feet, not 1
22 inch equals 30 feet.

23 Also, the linear inch measurement on
24 many of the maps is actually 1 and 1/8th inch
25 in length, a discrepancy of 12 percent.

1 My question is, do these errors have
2 any effect on the site plans?

3 MR. LANZAFAMA: Mr. Chairman, do you
4 want me to respond or --

5 CHAIRMAN HANDS: Would you mind?
6 Yeah, because I know you had an e-mail.
7 Please, yes.

8 MR. LANZAFAMA: Yeah.
9 Mr. Carruthers, we did identify that. It was
10 a problem with their plotting of their graphic
11 scale. The site plans themselves were
12 accurately to scale. The latest plans that
13 they submitted dated August 25th, I believe
14 that has been corrected and the drawings are
15 to scale and the graphic scales are
16 accurately represented on the faces of the
17 drawings.

18 MR. CARRUTHERS: Okay. Thank you,
19 Mr. Lanzafama.

20 We have concerns about the soils and
21 how they are being remediated and we had
22 expressed those concerns, but I will raise
23 them at a future date or I'll have our -- the
24 new chair of the EC raise them at a future
25 date and I'll keep my comments this evening to

1 questions as was requested.

2 So I have a question for
3 Mr. Fourniadis, in that at -- this refers to
4 the 2019 NJ Master Plan which speaks to
5 reducing energy consumption and emissions
6 from the building sector through decarbonation
7 and electrification of new and existing
8 buildings. Specifically Section 4.1.2
9 seeks to partner with private industry to
10 establish electrified building demonstration
11 projects.

12 At the preliminary hearing on March
13 3rd, I raised a question with Mr. Fourniadis
14 of having at least one building built as an
15 all-electric demonstration project and I
16 supplied his office with the appropriate
17 contact name at the NJ BPU to follow up
18 with.

19 My question is, has this been
20 followed through and to what resolution?

21 MR. FOURNIADIS: It has not. We
22 discussed it internally and determined that it
23 wasn't something we were going to pursue. We
24 are not believers in an all-electric building.
25 We don't think there's a market and we decided

1 not to go any further with it.

2 MR. CARRUTHERS: Okay. My next
3 question is concerned with the heating
4 system. Would you clarify what heating fuel
5 will be used?

6 MR. FOURNIADIS: Natural gas.

7 MR. CARRUTHERS: Okay. What is the
8 AFUE of the furnace that's being proposed?

9 MR. FOURNIADIS: I don't know. We
10 haven't designed our MEP system, our
11 mechanical, electric and plumbing system yet,
12 but whenever we do, we try and go with the
13 most efficient systems appropriate for the
14 structures that we're designing. We don't
15 want to oversize them. No need to do
16 that. We certainly don't want to undersize
17 them.

18 And we're always looking to use the
19 most fuel-efficient equipment, not just in our
20 heating and ventil -- HVAC, but also in
21 refrigerators, dishwashers, washers, dryers,
22 and things like that.

23 MR. CARRUTHERS: I'm glad to hear
24 that.

25 I would ask that the Planning Board

1 pay attention to this area when they are
2 reviewing the final details because these more
3 efficient furnaces will help reduce heating
4 costs for the renters, but would also improve
5 air quality in the area.

6 Thank you, Mr. Fourniadis, on
7 that.

8 My next comment -- question is
9 regarding electric vehicle charging points. I
10 note that there are only four charging
11 stations proposed for 140 units. And to give
12 a little bit of historical background, Section
13 6.3.3 of the 2019 New Jersey Energy Master
14 Plan states that the state wishes to build or
15 incentivize EV charging infrastructure and to
16 incentivize the adoption of electric vehicles
17 in low-income communities.

18 Now, as of 2019, December of 2019,
19 there were slightly over 30,000 electric
20 vehicles, or EVs, registered in New Jersey.
21 The State is pushing to see a target of
22 330,000 EVs registered by 2025, which is in
23 only five years' time.

24 My question is, will -- or could the
25 developer see their way to installing EV

1 charging stations in each of the garages and
2 to installing at least one charging station in
3 each parking area?

4 MR. REGAN: Bob, before you answer,
5 just my notes indicate that, through prior
6 testimony, the applicant agreed to increase
7 the number to six from four with one
8 additional charging station being installed
9 if the bank, the proposed bank parking, was
10 expanded.

11 But I'll let -- Bob, I'll let you
12 respond to the question on, you know,
13 installing them in the building and
14 garages.

15 MR. FOURNIADIS: Yeah. Right now we
16 don't see a need for installing them in the
17 garages. As I said before about the waste
18 management, the nice thing about this being an
19 apartment project instead of a condominium is,
20 as the owner, we can react to the market. If
21 we get to the point where, you know, everybody
22 has an electric vehicle, then we can go in and
23 install the charging stations inside the
24 garages. If that's something that the market
25 asks for, we can accommodate it.

1 But at this point, we think six is
2 plenty. But if the market evolves, we can
3 evolve with it because we'll continue to own
4 this and we certainly want to do what the
5 market is demanding of us. Right now it's not
6 demanding it.

7 CHAIRMAN HANDS: Just a point on
8 that. We talked about in the garages maybe
9 using 220 volts. Not in charging stations, we
10 don't need the charging stations, but 220
11 would be beneficial. That's just a note from
12 the past.

13 MR. CARRUTHERS: That was going to
14 be my next question.

15 CHAIRMAN HANDS: Oh, I'm sorry.

16 MR. CARRUTHERS: That's okay.

17 I hope that, Mr. Fourniadis, you
18 are proven wrong very soon and that the
19 State's target is proven to be
20 underoptimistic.

21 So I think they were the main
22 questions that I have. There will be future
23 comments presented to the Board at the next
24 opportunity. Thank you again for the
25 opportunity to speak.

1 CHAIRMAN HANDS: Thank you, Terry.

2 COORDINATOR COONCE: Next up is

3 Mr. Arentowicz.

4 Mr. Arentowicz?

5 MR. ARENTOWICZ: Yes. Charles

6 Arentowicz, Millington.

7 Can you all hear me tonight?

8 CHAIRMAN HANDS: Yes.

9 MR. ARENTOWICZ: Thank you for the
10 opportunity to question the architect and --
11 even though no questions were allowed on the
12 fifth affordable housing unit for the
13 consistency to the master plan, which we spent
14 \$37,500, which we haven't seen yet.

15 Mr. Alberto, if I am driving from
16 the Passaic River on Stone House Road in a
17 four-door sedan to Division Avenue, what is
18 going to be on my left out the window?

19 THE WITNESS: If you're driving on
20 Stone House Road?

21 MR. ARENTOWICZ: From the river,
22 that is correct.

23 THE WITNESS: Three units.

24 MR. ARENTOWICZ: No. What am I
25 going to see out the window, parallel to the

1 window?

2 THE WITNESS: A berm, I believe.

3 MR. ARENTOWICZ: You don't know?

4 MR. FOURNIADIS: I think that's a
5 question for the engineer.

6 MR. REGAN: I'm not --

7 MR. ARENTOWICZ: He's the architect,
8 is he not?

9 THE WITNESS: Right. I didn't
10 design the site plan.

11 MR. ARENTOWICZ: Well, what did you
12 do, Mr. Alberto?

13 THE WITNESS: I designed the
14 architecture, the buildings. So the site plan
15 was created by an engineering and planning
16 company and we did the architecture.

17 MR. ARENTOWICZ: Well, who can
18 answer the question then?

19 THE WITNESS: I don't know if we --

20 MR. REGAN: I think what Mr. Alberto
21 just responded is that, as you come up, there
22 are three buildings on that side of the site.
23 So you'd see -- I mean, I don't know that it's
24 a berm. It's going to be a retaining wall, a
25 stepped retaining wall, and the backs of three

1 of the residential buildings.

2 Is that correct, Angelo?

3 THE WITNESS: Yes.

4 MR. ARENTOWICZ: Then, Mr. Angelo --
5 Mr. Alberto, if my car is a four-door sedan,
6 when would I see the height or the foundation
7 of the building? How far up?

8 MR. REGAN: I'm not sure that he's
9 qualified to --

10 MR. ARENTOWICZ: Oh, okay. Who can
11 answer it then?

12 MR. REGAN: I'm not sure that
13 anybody can answer that question.

14 MR. ARENTOWICZ: It's too
15 complicated? We put a man on the moon 52
16 years ago. I'm asking to drive up the
17 road.

18 MR. REGAN: I don't think that any
19 of our professionals are prepared to answer
20 that question. I don't think that --

21 MR. ARENTOWICZ: Okay. I'm going to
22 drive up Division Avenue -- not Road,
23 Mr. Alberto. If I'm coming from Valley Road
24 driving up Division Avenue to Long Hill Road
25 and I look to my left, in a four-door sedan,

1 what am I going to see from Stone House Road
2 to Long Hill Road? Out my --

3 MR. FOURNIADIS: Frank, can't we ask
4 the Board to limit his questions to the
5 architect, about the architect's testimony?
6 Isn't that where we are right now?

7 MR. REGAN: That's where we are,
8 correct.

9 CHAIRMAN HANDS: Chuck, can you just
10 direct --

11 MR. ARENTOWICZ: If these questions
12 are too complicated, I'm sorry.

13 MAYOR RAE: It's not that they're
14 complicated, they're just irrelevant.

15 MR. ARENTOWICZ: Why don't you go
16 home, Brendan. You cut off the conversation
17 two hours ago. Go home and turn off your --
18 turn off your speaker. Okay?

19 MAYOR RAE: Actually, the beauty of
20 Zoom, I'm actually at home, Chuck.

21 MR. ARENTOWICZ: Yeah. Well, turn
22 off your -- turn off your Zoom then.

23 CHAIRMAN HANDS: Okay. Let's just
24 get back on track.

25 MR. ARENTOWICZ: All right. So

1 let's answer my question. I'm driving on
2 Division -- keep laughing, Brendan, because
3 you're done. Okay?

4 I'm driving up Division Avenue. I
5 look to my left. What do I see?

6 MR. FOURNIADIS: He's not going to
7 answer that.

8 MR. REGAN: Put up the site plan.

9 MR. FOURNIADIS: Yeah.

10 THE WITNESS: You would see the ends
11 of these three structures across this buffer
12 area and you'll see the retail facing Division
13 Avenue.

14 MR. ARENTOWICZ: What level of
15 building am I going to see when I'm on
16 Division Avenue? How high is it?

17 MR. FOURNIADIS: The architect
18 doesn't know. How many different ways do we
19 have to say it?

20 MR. ARENTOWICZ: Well,
21 Mr. Fourniadis, can you tell us? You're so
22 knowledgeable.

23 MR. FOURNIADIS: It's Fourniadis
24 (pronunciation). Fourniadis. I've been here
25 four years. You could at least pronounce my

1 name properly.

2 MR. ARENTOWICZ: I don't know it.

3 MR. FOURNIADIS: I'm not an engineer
4 either. I would have -- I would have answered
5 it exactly as Angelo just did. If you're
6 going to drive up Division Avenue, you're
7 going to see the side of three buildings, some
8 landscaping, and then a retail building.

9 MR. ARENTOWICZ: What's the height
10 I'm going to see?

11 MR. REGAN: The height of what?

12 MR. ARENTOWICZ: The building of
13 retail, 4,99- square feet.

14 MR. REGAN: How tall is the
15 building, Angelo?

16 MR. FOURNIADIS: The building --

17 MR. REGAN: Let -- Angelo, how tall
18 is the building?

19 THE WITNESS: The building is three
20 and a half -- three stories with --

21 MR. REGAN: No, no, no. The retail
22 building.

23 THE WITNESS: The retail building is
24 20 feet high and the --

25 MR. REGAN: Okay.

1 requests one speaker.)

2 MR. ARENTOWICZ: One speaker,
3 Mr. Rae.

4 BOARD MEMBER PFEIL: Mayor Rae.

5 MAYOR RAE: Just, I guess, some
6 clarity, Chuck, that's all.

7 VICE CHAIRMAN JONES: I guess what
8 we're missing is the -- how tall --

9 MR. ARENTOWICZ: Keep laughing,
10 Brendan.

11 VICE CHAIRMAN JONES: I guess what
12 we're missing is how tall -- where is
13 Mr. Arentowicz's eyes to the road? So we can
14 start with the elevation point.

15 MAYOR RAE: And I think, also, how
16 tall is Mr. Arentowicz?

17 VICE CHAIRMAN JONES: Yeah, when
18 he's sitting in that four-door sedan.

19 MAYOR RAE: There's multiple pieces
20 of information that we're missing in this
21 scenario.

22 MR. ARENTOWICZ: It's real
23 complicated. It's real complicated.

24 CHAIRMAN HANDS: Chuck, what are you
25 trying to drive to, please? Can we just get

1 to the --

2 MR. ARENTOWICZ: We just added a
3 said dormer on top of the retail building. So
4 when I drive up there, what am I going to see
5 at street level?

6 VICE CHAIRMAN JONES: You're going
7 to see the roof.

8 MR. ARENTOWICZ: I'm going to see
9 the roof?

10 VICE CHAIRMAN JONES: Yeah. Well,
11 you're not going to see the --

12 MR. REGAN: Look, I think from the
13 applicant's perspective, Mr. Arentowicz, you
14 know, Mr. Alberto indicated he did not do a
15 study as to, you know, sightlines from the
16 street into the site. So I don't think
17 anybody is qualified -- he's not qualified
18 because he hasn't done that study and I don't
19 believe anybody else, you know, on behalf of
20 the applicant has done that. So I don't think
21 we can respond to that other than as simply as
22 we did.

23 MR. ARENTOWICZ: Well, here's the
24 reason I'm asking these questions. If this
25 Planning Board approved this site because they

1 said, oh, the land slopes down, so we can
2 build 45 feet back on the buildings on Stone
3 House Road, and they're going to end up being
4 a lot higher than what they expected. That's
5 the issue. That's the big issue.

6 Anybody want to comment on that?

7 MR. REGAN: Well, on behalf of the
8 applicant, you know, the applicant designed
9 the plan in compliance with the zoning
10 ordinance requirements for this site.

11 MR. ARENTOWICZ: Mr. Chairman, do
12 you want to comment when you approved this
13 site about the slope of the land? Or
14 Mr. Pfeil because I think he was chairman
15 then.

16 Mr. Pfeil?

17 CHAIRMAN HANDS: Hold on a second.
18 Just as a matter of interest, the geography
19 up, if you -- this is obviously not an
20 architectural question at this point, I
21 guess.

22 MR. ARENTOWICZ: If the elevation
23 isn't an architectural question, what do you
24 want me to do?

25 CHAIRMAN HANDS: No, no. Hold on a

1 second. I'm just -- I'm just adding on.

2 I was just going to ask, just can
3 we have a clarification of the height
4 differential between the top northeast corner
5 and the southwest corner?

6 MR. ARENTOWICZ: Yeah. When you
7 approved that -- the lot for this unit back in
8 2018.

9 CHAIRMAN HANDS: Yeah. I just
10 wondered what this plan is calling for and any
11 difference to the current geography of the
12 land. It obviously dips down to the
13 southeast -- west corner.

14 MR. ARENTOWICZ: If you're going to
15 put fill in, it's not going to dip down.

16 CHAIRMAN HANDS: That's what I'm
17 just getting to, Chuck. I just wanted to get
18 to that point of how much -- what's the
19 gradient change, current to new, based upon
20 their site plan.

21 MR. ARENTOWICZ: If I'm standing at
22 the train station.

23 MR. REGAN: Mr. Chairman --

24 MR. ARENTOWICZ: Let him answer.

25 MR. REGAN: Mr. Chairman, the

1 architect I don't think is necessarily, you
2 know, intimately knowledgeable about the
3 changes in the grade on the property. Our
4 engineer did testify, you know, in his
5 testimony with regards to, you know, the
6 bulkhead, the grading, the proposed grading
7 of the site and the change in elevations.
8 He did not testify as to how that would
9 look --

10 CHAIRMAN HANDS: And, also, I think
11 that these buildings are, what, three
12 stories?

13 THE WITNESS: Yes.

14 CHAIRMAN HANDS: Right. I think the
15 concept previously was that there may be
16 accommodation for a fourth story because of
17 the grading going down towards the back, but I
18 don't think that's a factor so much here
19 because the buildings are not that height.

20 MR. REGAN: They're not permitted to
21 be. They're only permitted to be three
22 stories, 45 feet, and that's what's proposed
23 for each of the buildings.

24 CHAIRMAN HANDS: Right. Before we
25 were thinking, at different parts, maybe a

1 fourth to accommodate if the sightline would
2 dip as you go to the southwest corner. But
3 less of an issue now because the heights and
4 all that, that isn't such a factor.

5 MR. ARENTOWICZ: Well, I'll have
6 former chairman Pheil comment on this.
7 Because I'm confused.

8 CHAIRMAN HANDS: And did your
9 recollection differ to what I just said?

10 MR. ARENTOWICZ: Yes.

11 BOARD MEMBER MALINOUSKY: David,
12 take a quick look at the grading plans.

13 CHAIRMAN HANDS: Thank you, Tom.

14 BOARD MEMBER MALINOUSKY: Between
15 the top of curb on Division Avenue and the top
16 of curb at Building 12 is about a 4-foot
17 difference. That's the cross between this
18 area and the parking area.

19 CHAIRMAN HANDS: Tom, was that --
20 can you give me -- can you give me those two
21 points again?

22 BOARD MEMBER MALINOUSKY: From the
23 top of curb on Division Avenue, the elevation
24 is 270.01. And if you go straight across
25 towards Building 12, where the curb there is

1 266.13 to top of curb.

2 CHAIRMAN HANDS: Building 12 I can't
3 see. Is that bottom left?

4 BOARD MEMBER MALINOUSKY: It's right
5 in the center, just a little south of the
6 entranceway on Division Avenue.

7 CHAIRMAN HANDS: All right. That's
8 to that top curb.

9 BOARD MEMBER MALINOUSKY: By
10 Building 12.

11 MR. ARENTOWICZ: So is that what the
12 Planning Board approved when this zone was
13 approved for affordable housing?

14 CHAIRMAN HANDS: Whatever the
15 ordinance reads.

16 MR. ARENTOWICZ: That's not the
17 question.

18 VICE CHAIRMAN JONES: I don't think
19 the ordinance talks about elevation of the
20 land itself.

21 CHAIRMAN HANDS: No.

22 MR. ARENTOWICZ: You discussed the
23 slope of the land. That's why you granted 45
24 feet.

25 Do you recollect -- anybody

1 recollect that conversation?

2 CHAIRMAN HANDS: Chuck. Chuck,
3 what's your point for this?

4 MR. ARENTOWICZ: They raised the
5 elevation in the back of the property on Stone
6 House and the elevation that you approved is
7 going to be a lot higher when you stand at the
8 Millington Train Station.

9 CHAIRMAN HANDS: Okay.

10 MR. ARENTOWICZ: So you should
11 approve something 40 feet or below. That's
12 the point.

13 CHAIRMAN HANDS: And the ordinance
14 says 45 feet.

15 MR. ARENTOWICZ: Because of the
16 slope of the land. That's what you agreed to
17 when you approved this. You might not all
18 recollect that. I certainly do.

19 CHAIRMAN HANDS: Are you able to --
20 just as a matter of interest, maybe we can get
21 the engineer back again at some point just to
22 clarify the elevation changes between the
23 northwest and southwest corners.

24 MR. ARENTOWICZ: That would be
25 great.

1 CHAIRMAN HANDS: Yes.

2 MR. ARENTOWICZ: That would be
3 great.

4 CHAIRMAN HANDS: Can we leave that
5 for --

6 MR. ARENTOWICZ: No one knows. I
7 mean, we put a man on the moon 52 years ago
8 and we're trying to get an elevation and
9 nobody knows.

10 CHAIRMAN HANDS: Can I leave that as
11 a question for the engineer when he comes back
12 just to clear up --

13 MR. ARENTOWICZ: That would be
14 great, Mr. Hands.

15 MR. REGAN: From where,
16 Mr. Chairman? What two points? I apologize,
17 I didn't catch it.

18 CHAIRMAN HANDS: Basically the
19 northeast corner just, you know, above the
20 retail and the southwest corner. I don't
21 recall what building number that is, but
22 the first house on Stone House. Just a simple
23 clarification of the height differential today
24 and the proposed -- based upon infill, what
25 that elevation change will be.

1 MAYOR RAE: David, will it make any
2 change? Will it make any difference?

3 MR. ARENTOWICZ: Yes, it will.

4 MAYOR RAE: Well, I'm asking David.

5 CHAIRMAN HANDS: I just want to make
6 sure. I just want to clarify for my own
7 purposes. I'd just like to have that
8 clarified, as just informational. I'm going
9 to presume it doesn't really impact the
10 proposed concept of -- being as though it's a
11 massive development. We'll have -- they're
12 all 45-foot height building. There's going to
13 be a gradient down, so I don't think you're
14 going to feel -- the intent -- the issue was
15 not to feel the massive buildings, taking
16 advantage of the topography of the land.

17 I'm just curious. I'd just like to
18 make sure that there's still some elevation
19 change in that sense, you know, it's not a
20 mass developed --

21 MR. ARENTOWICZ: Let me remind
22 Mr. Rae that's why it was approved, because
23 the land sloped. Now it doesn't slope. So
24 he's wrong.

25 MR. FOURNIADIS: Well, I think it

1 was approved because you were sued by Fair
2 Share Housing and this was part of your
3 affordable housing settlement.

4 MR. ARENTOWICZ: No, we haven't been
5 sued yet.

6 MR. FOURNIADIS: Mr. Chairman.
7 Mr. Chairman, I just want to clarify so we can
8 answer your question properly. You're talking
9 about top of curb, correct?

10 CHAIRMAN HANDS: Yes.

11 MR. FOURNIADIS: Top of curb in the
12 northeast corner, top of curb in front of
13 Building 6, which is the southwest building.

14 CHAIRMAN HANDS: Yes. So basically
15 on Stone House -- from Stone House Road up to
16 Division Avenue, those two. The corner of
17 Division and Stone House, the first point and
18 the second point.

19 MR. FOURNIADIS: What point near
20 Stone House Road do you want the measurement?
21 Do you want it down at Stone House Road or do
22 you want it top of curb in front of Building
23 6?

24 CHAIRMAN HANDS: Thank you for
25 saying that. I think the top of the curb.

1 Where the building is. Thank you for doing
2 that. The brick --

3 MR. FOURNIADIS: That's the
4 southwest -- the southwest building. I think
5 our architect -- I mean, I'm sorry, our
6 engineer can give us that number, not that
7 it's going to change anything.

8 CHAIRMAN HANDS: Thank you.

9 BOARD MEMBER MALINOUSKY: David, all
10 the existing grades are shown on the grading
11 plan also.

12 CHAIRMAN HANDS: Right. I just
13 don't have it easy to see.

14 Tom, can you quickly state -- if
15 not, Chuck, can you please move on to another
16 question?

17 MR. ARENTOWICZ: Well, here's the
18 question: With all the ratios, I don't know
19 what diagram is right. So is the diagram up
20 right on the screen now with the elevations
21 and what we're showing in the ratios?

22 MR. REGAN: The site plans reflect
23 the proposed, the current -- I mean, the
24 survey would show the current grades and the
25 site plan --

1 MR. ARENTOWICZ: The ratios are
2 correct now, is that correct?

3 MR. REGAN: And the grading plan
4 would show what's proposed.

5 MR. ARENTOWICZ: Are the ratios
6 correct?

7 MR. REGAN: I'm not --

8 MR. ARENTOWICZ: The answer is yes
9 or no.

10 MR. REGAN: I don't know what the
11 question -- I'm not qualified --

12 MR. ARENTOWICZ: I'll ask you the
13 question. Are the ratios --

14 MR. REGAN: I am not qualified to
15 answer that question.

16 MR. ARENTOWICZ: Well, get someone
17 that can.

18 BOARD MEMBER PFEIL: Oh, stop it.
19 This is ridiculous.

20 MR. ARENTOWICZ: Why don't you take
21 it off.

22 MR. LANZAFAMA: Mr. Chairman, could
23 I intervene?

24 CHAIRMAN HANDS: Yeah, I was going
25 to say -- please. Would you mind? You might

1 have the facts based upon the comments
2 earlier.

3 MR. LANZAFAMA: The -- the grading
4 plan -- which I don't know if the gentleman
5 can access it from the website, but it is
6 available on the website. And the grading
7 plan, which is Sheet C-6, I believe,
8 demonstrates the existing topography and the
9 proposed topography. The existing contour
10 line, which is shown as dashed lines, the
11 proposed are shown as solid lines.

12 In the northeast corner at the
13 intersection of Commerce Street and Division
14 Avenue, the elevation is approximately 274
15 feet if -- under existing conditions and
16 proposed.

17 The retail building is going to be
18 set down at elevation 270. So it is below the
19 street grade by approximately 4 feet. As you
20 move to the south and west, the site in its
21 original condition had dropped significantly.
22 It had dropped about 20, 25 feet.

23 In the design what was developed was
24 that there was a series of terraces created in
25 that southwest corner that elevates that area

1 approximately 12 feet above the existing
2 condition.

3 So the buildings that are located in
4 that southwest corner, I believe it's Building
5 Number 6, is at about elevation 263, 264. So
6 that's about 6 feet below the intersection of
7 Commerce and Division Avenue.

8 I hope that answers your question.

9 CHAIRMAN HANDS: Thank you. Thank
10 you. We're still showing a drop-off towards
11 the southwest corner.

12 MR. LANZAFAMA: That's correct.

13 CHAIRMAN HANDS: Thank you.

14 Chuck, can you -- do you have
15 another question, please?

16 MR. ARENTOWICZ: Oh, you've all been
17 so gracious and knowledgeable. I want to
18 thank all of you, especially Mr. Rae.

19 VICE CHAIRMAN JONES: Request to
20 move on.

21 COORDINATOR COONCE: Mr. Arentowicz,
22 do you have any more questions?

23 MR. ARENTOWICZ: I lowered my hand.

24 CHAIRMAN HANDS: Thank you.

25 COORDINATOR COONCE: Okay. Moving

1 on to Mr. Bill Kaufman.

2 BOARD MEMBER PFEIL: Mr. Chairman,
3 before we go there, we're about two hours in.
4 Can we do a little bit of a break?

5 VICE CHAIRMAN JONES: Second.

6 CHAIRMAN HANDS: Yeah. How about
7 9:30?

8 BOARD MEMBER PFEIL: Great.

9 CHAIRMAN HANDS: Thank you, all.
10 Bill, hold on for a second. I mean,
11 you can go for a break, but -- ten -- eight
12 minutes.

13 (Whereupon, a recess is taken.)

14 COORDINATOR COONCE: Okay. We're
15 back.

16 So, Bill Kaufman is up.

17 Bill, are you there?

18 MR. KAUFMAN: I'm here.

19 CHAIRMAN HANDS: Thank you.

20 MR. KAUFMAN: So Bill Kaufman,
21 Millington. I just have, hopefully, a quick
22 question for Mr. Alberto.

23 Mr. Alberto, can you bring up the
24 exhibit that you just recently presented with
25 the revised -- I believe it was the right

1 elevation?

2 MR. REGAN: Do you want the retail
3 elevation?

4 MR. KAUFMAN: No, I'm sorry, the
5 retail building with the -- we talked about
6 trash cans and there was a revision of that
7 elevation.

8 MR. FOURNIADIS: Is Angelo back?
9 Angelo, you're muted.

10 CHAIRMAN HANDS: I think he went to
11 the first statue out in the middle of the --

12 THE WITNESS: Yeah, I apologize for
13 that. I couldn't find my mute button once I
14 shared my screen. Okay. I'm going to share
15 the screen now.

16 Which -- I'm sorry, which drawing
17 did you want to see?

18 MR. KAUFMAN: The residential --
19 yeah, Number 11 there. Sheet 11 I think it
20 is. Actually, no, that's not the one you
21 revised, right?

22 MR. FOURNIADIS: The one with the
23 trash cans.

24 MR. KAUFMAN: There you go.

25 Okay. Could you just point out,

1 there are -- it looks like to me in the lower
2 left side of that elevation on the first
3 floor, there are three -- three mandoor
4 there. Could you just point out what those
5 are?

6 THE WITNESS: Right. First of all,
7 these doors are either the electrical or
8 sprinkler closet and these would be entrance
9 doors.

10 MR. KAUFMAN: When you say "entrance
11 doors," that's the entrance door to the unit
12 B-2, B-3 and E?

13 THE WITNESS: Yes.

14 MR. KAUFMAN: Okay. And that -- and
15 those are the front doors of those units, the
16 main entrance?

17 THE WITNESS: Yes.

18 MR. KAUFMAN: Okay.

19 THE WITNESS: Correct. And you can
20 see that here on the plan. Here's the door
21 and then these two going upstairs. There's
22 one, two, three.

23 MR. KAUFMAN: All right. So it's
24 the B-1, the B-2 -- or wouldn't the case be
25 B-1, B-2, and then it's an A unit, I suppose,

1 on the left, right?

2 THE WITNESS: Yeah.

3 MR. FOURNIADIS: A on the other
4 side.

5 THE WITNESS: Right. A in the back
6 and the B's up above. Correct.

7 MR. KAUFMAN: All right. Which --
8 which one of those -- which one of those
9 sides, based on that plan you're looking at
10 there, faces Division Avenue?

11 THE WITNESS: Well, the sides are
12 --

13 MR. KAUFMAN: Let me give you a
14 building. Buildings 8, 10 and 12. I'm sorry,
15 I should have clarified that. They're labeled
16 left and right, so I just am curious as to
17 which ones. So Buildings 8, 10 and 12.

18 THE WITNESS: Eight, 10 and 12.
19 Well, the ends are symmetrical, so --

20 MR. KAUFMAN: Right. So they're the
21 same regardless.

22 THE WITNESS: Yes.

23 MR. KAUFMAN: And -- and then -- so
24 if you go back to your Revised Sheet Number 12
25 there, I just want to -- I just want to

1 confirm that the front doors of Buildings
2 either B-2, B-3 and E or A, depending on which
3 way the building's facing, those front doors
4 face Division Avenue, is that correct?

5 THE WITNESS: Correct.

6 MR. KAUFMAN: Okay. That's the only
7 questions I had. Thank you.

8 CHAIRMAN HANDS: Thank you.

9 Debra, I see Pam's next, I think.

10 COORDINATOR COONCE: Okay. Let me
11 just see. Let's go to Pam.

12 Hi, Pam. Are you there?

13 MS. OGENS: Yes, I am. Can you hear
14 me?

15 CHAIRMAN HANDS: Yes.

16 MS. OGENS: Okay. Let me just get
17 to my notes here. And first I want to just
18 say that the revised rendering for the retail
19 business -- retail building is nice to see.
20 Definitely you're on a better track and I
21 commend you for that.

22 And here's my question: I challenge
23 you, architect, developer, to do the same for
24 the 14 residential units. You've made
25 improvements. The retail building is more in

1 keeping with the architecture of the buildings
2 in the vicinity and the history of the
3 downtown area with the buildings. And I'd
4 like to challenge you to do the same, in
5 modifying the 14 residential buildings, to
6 come up with a plan that is more in keeping
7 with the area as you showed you are capable of
8 doing in the retail building. And I ask you
9 to please accept my challenge.

10 MR. FOURNIADIS: Well, if I --
11 Angelo already addressed the retail building.
12 And it's retail and we wanted it to look a
13 little bit like a train station, look closer
14 to the buildings where the post office is,
15 where the bank is. But the residential -- I
16 mean, I've spent a lot of time in Millington
17 in the last four years, five years, six
18 years. We put this property under contract in
19 2014. It's a great town. Long Hill's a great
20 town. That's why we came here. That's why we
21 stuck it out.

22 But, you know, the residential
23 buildings shouldn't look like the bank
24 building and the post office, in my opinion,
25 and I've been doing this for almost 40 years.

1 They should look like residential buildings.
2 They're a mix of siding, brick, trim, some
3 shakes. And when I drive through Millington
4 and I see the homes there, I see homes that
5 are a mix of siding, brick, some stone,
6 front-facing garages, sometimes side-loaded
7 garages.

8 I don't see that -- you know, if
9 this was a town where every house was a Cape
10 Cod and I brought these buildings in, I could
11 say, Wow, they're right, I could do something
12 different. But the finished materials here in
13 my opinion are consistent with a residential
14 product. And when you're going to do
15 apartments and you're going to do 12 units to
16 the acre, you're going to have three-story
17 buildings. There's just no other way around
18 it.

19 And what we did was something that
20 we thought was consistent with what we see in
21 the area. Colonial style, but not purely
22 colonial, brick siding, nice trim, nice
23 bunting, a lot of windows. I don't see any
24 reason to change it.

25 MS. OGENS: Well, sir, your previous

1 architectural drawings when this was called
2 Millington Village showed a lot more detail,
3 showed more interest --

4 MR. FOURNIADIS: As I said --

5 MS. OGENS: May I finish, please?
6 May I please finish?

7 MR. FOURNIADIS: Sure.

8 MS. OGENS: I'm still speaking.
9 Thank you.

10 MR. FOURNIADIS: I'm sorry.

11 MS. OGENS: You spoke about
12 marketability. Having been a renter most of
13 my life, one of the big marketing features for
14 me was a balcony. And especially in these
15 days of quarantine, limited access to outside
16 activities, I would think that a balcony would
17 be a very desirable marketing feature.

18 Certainly from an architectural
19 standpoint, when I have showed the plans to
20 people who don't know the area, I'd say -- and
21 I have asked: Where would you rather live, in
22 this building or this building?
23 Overwhelmingly -- maybe it's my choice of
24 friends, I'm not coloring their decision in
25 any way -- they chose the former and not the

1 latter.

2 So I am challenging you -- and a
3 simple yes or no would be sufficient -- to go
4 back and look at those 14 buildings, compare
5 them to the buildings that you had previously
6 submitted on your website for Millington
7 Village, and see the lack of detail and
8 especially the lack of any balconies.

9 If you say no -- and you have stated
10 in the past that it was the Planning Board's
11 decision; that they did not approve your
12 earlier plans. And you spoke of the
13 Millington Firehouse meeting, I just would
14 like to remind you that there was no Planning
15 Board input by design at the Millington
16 Firehouse meeting. So that was not a correct
17 statement.

18 Why did you change so dramatically,
19 so drastically? Is it -- could the fact that
20 you have to go from 220 units to 140 units, so
21 you've downscaled the features, the
22 architectural appearance-appealing features to
23 your buildings?

24 Yes or no, do you accept the
25 challenge --

1 MR. FOURNIADIS: I do not --

2 MS. OGENS: -- to make these
3 buildings more appropriate? For the record.

4 MR. FOURNIADIS: I do not.

5 MS. OGENS: Okay. I have a second
6 question. Is it possible to bring up Exhibit
7 A-5, site plan? If not, I can just
8 describe --

9 THE WITNESS: This may not be A-5.

10 MS. OGENS: That's okay. That one
11 will do.

12 THE WITNESS: Okay.

13 MS. OGENS: So if you look at that,
14 you see in front of the residential buildings
15 that are along Division Avenue, not the
16 retail, just the residential, you can see --
17 thank you. You can see four parking spaces
18 between Buildings 10 and 12.

19 THE WITNESS: I don't think this is
20 the updated parking layout, ma'am.

21 MS. OGENS: That's exactly my point.
22 Thank you, sir.

23 THE WITNESS: Okay.

24 MS. OGENS: So I do want -- I do
25 want from this point forward, please, when we

1 show these plans, if it's possible for you to
2 show Exhibit A-7. If not, I'll make a comment
3 about it.

4 If you look at A-5, which is very
5 similar to the one that you have up now, you
6 see four parking spaces that are visible along
7 Division Avenue between Buildings 10 and 12.
8 And I guess it could be said one is visible --
9 one parking space is visible along Building 8
10 or from Division Avenue.

11 If you are able to -- but I refer
12 people to Exhibit A-7, which was later
13 downloaded. There are now 18 parking
14 spaces that will be visible from Division
15 Avenue. This changes the streetscape
16 considerably. Rather than looking at some
17 landscaped areas in front of, side of
18 buildings, now the streetscape will be 18
19 parking spaces along Division Avenue.

20 And the nice trees in the picture
21 and the trees that Long Hill residents look
22 at all the time on Division Avenue of course
23 will be gone and they will be replaced by
24 smaller trees. This changes the whole
25 concept.

1 So my question is, will you be able
2 to from now on, when you refer to site plans,
3 please show the latest site plans with the 18
4 parking spaces that will be visible as you
5 drive down Division Avenue versus what you see
6 now? Can you do that, please?

7 THE WITNESS: Yeah. I just would --
8 all of our architectural drawings say that the
9 landscape is representative and refer to the
10 engineering plans. We just put this up for
11 illustrative purposes, but I can certainly do
12 that if I --

13 MR. FOURNIADIS: Angelo, the answer
14 to the question is yes.

15 THE WITNESS: Yes.

16 MR. FOURNIADIS: Yes, we'll put the
17 new one up.

18 MR. LANZAFAMA: Mr. Chairman --

19 MR. FOURNIADIS: I would like to
20 add, even though you didn't ask a question --

21 MS. OGENS: I'm sorry? Excuse me?

22 MR. LANZAFAMA: Mr. Chairman, could
23 I explain?

24 CHAIRMAN HANDS: Bob, were you going
25 to say something first before we go to

1 Michael? He's dropped off, I think.

2 MR. REGAN: Bob, let the engineer
3 go.

4 CHAIRMAN HANDS: Michael, you can
5 carry on.

6 MR. LANZAFAMA: Ms. Ogens is it?

7 MS. OGENS: Ogens (pronunciation).
8 Ogens.

9 MR. LANZAFAMA: Ogens. This is
10 Mike Lanzafama, the Board engineer. The
11 reason that we had them add that additional
12 parking was because we felt there was a
13 shortfall in visitor parking and there was
14 insufficient parking in that southern region
15 of the project and we wanted to ensure that
16 there was no overflow parking occurring off
17 site. And to compensate for that, we had them
18 increase substantially the amount of
19 landscaping along Division Avenue.

20 If you look at the latest set of
21 plans that were submitted dated August 25th,
22 and if you refer to sheet -- the landscape
23 plan, Sheet Z-11, you'll see that we had them
24 add a substantial amount of evergreen
25 plantings besides the street trees to mitigate

1 that and to further screen that out. They've
2 increased the number of trees on site from 96
3 to 150 as a result of the buffering that we
4 had them add in.

5 So it's a balancing act you often
6 have to do, but they put that in at our
7 request.

8 CHAIRMAN HANDS: Thank you, Mike.

9 MS. OGENS: Thank you. I appreciate
10 that. And certainly that is helpful.

11 Still, 18 parking spaces. I would
12 love to have some sort of artist rendering of
13 what it's going to look like with the new 150
14 versus 96 trees and add -- did you say, sir,
15 added shrubbery as well?

16 MR. LANZAFAMA: That -- that's
17 correct. They've increased the landscaping
18 substantially.

19 MS. OGENS: That's a help. Thank
20 you.

21 That's all I have.

22 CHAIRMAN HANDS: Okay. Thank you,
23 Pam.

24 COORDINATOR COONCE: All right. We
25 have -- moving on to Christina Berquist.

1 Christina, are you there?

2 MS. BERQUIST: Yes, I'm here. Can
3 you hear me?

4 COORDINATOR COONCE: Yep.

5 MS. BERQUIST: Okay.

6 Mr. Fourniadis, I have a question for you
7 based on what you said right before. You
8 said that, you know, Millington is a great
9 town and that's why you stuck it out for
10 years.

11 I've spent -- I would love to know,
12 what is it that you -- that you value about
13 Millington? You said that you've been
14 spending a lot of time here. So I would
15 imagine, you know, you can get yourself an
16 opinion on what it is that you value about
17 this town.

18 MR. FOURNIADIS: It's a good
19 location geographically, good schools. Part
20 of the Watchung Regional High School system.
21 You have a train station, close to 287, close
22 to 78. Cute little village which we hope to
23 augment. Good shopping, great Greek
24 restaurants.

25 You know, look, I've been in the

1 home building business since 1987. We'd like
2 to build homes where people are going to want
3 to live and Long Hill Township falls into that
4 category.

5 MS. BERQUIST: You're doing this
6 from a business perspective, of course, as you
7 should, because you're a businessman. And I'm
8 just wondering, as a resident, how I can feel
9 comfortable with relying solely on that.
10 Because, you know, obviously my perspective is
11 not a business perspective.

12 And so along those lines, I wanted
13 to ask you, how long do you plan -- or is
14 this, like, a longevity project for you or is
15 this something you plan on, you know, building
16 and then, you know -- is really just building
17 it your main objective here?

18 MR. FOURNIADIS: Look, I can't make
19 any long-term promises. Our current plan
20 right now is to build this and to own it. And
21 my partners and I want this to be a legacy
22 asset that we can one day pass on to our
23 children. But things change. You never
24 know.

25 So I would never commit that we

1 would never sell this property to another
2 apartment owner. But we want this property to
3 be successful; otherwise, we've just done it
4 for practice.

5 So, like I said, I've been in this
6 business since 1987. I built 10,000 homes
7 when I was with Calton Homes and Centex Homes
8 and every one of them has a family living in
9 them. And if you look at the stuff that Prism
10 has done in the past several years, you could
11 see we're -- it's not a fly-by-night company.
12 And it's got the zoning that makes sense;
13 otherwise, it would have stayed a warehouse.
14 I don't know what else I can tell you.

15 MS. BERQUIST: Okay. Fair enough.
16 Thank you.

17 I don't have any further questions.

18 CHAIRMAN HANDS: Okay. That's fine.
19 Christina, thank you for that.

20 I don't see anybody else's hand up.
21 Can I just double-check with, maybe, Don
22 Farnell, if he wishes to speak. I want to
23 make sure you're not -- if you don't wish to
24 speak, that's fine. I just wanted to give you
25 an opportunity just to mention that.

1 COORDINATOR COONCE: We have -- we
2 have a couple other questions.

3 Geno Moschetti. I apologize if I
4 pronounced that incorrectly. Geno.

5 MR. MOSCETTI: Close enough.

6 COORDINATOR COONCE: Okay.

7 MR. MOSCETTI: Geno from Stirling.
8 I have two questions, but you can answer them
9 after I make my comment. Is that okay?

10 COORDINATOR COONCE: This is not
11 comment period. This is questions only.

12 MR. MOSCETTI: All right. Then two
13 questions. Are any of the people from
14 Prism -- whether the attorneys, the
15 architects, anybody involved with that -- are
16 they going to live at this facility, these
17 facilities?

18 MR. FOURNIADIS: I'm not. I can't
19 speak for Frank or Angelo, but I'm not.

20 THE WITNESS: I'm not.

21 MR. FOURNIADIS: If I lived in every
22 development that I developed over the past 40
23 years, my wife would have left me and I would
24 have basically been a vagabond. So that's
25 really not a requirement as to whether or not

1 a real estate community is going to be
2 successful as to whether I move into it.

3 MR. MOSCETTI: If -- if we weren't
4 mandated to do this kind of housing with the
5 Fair Housing people, we'd be talking maybe
6 about 14 McMansions in this area, we wouldn't
7 have the animosity toward this large complex
8 being built.

9 MR. FOURNIADIS: Animosity? There's
10 animosity towards this project?

11 MR. MOSCETTI: I don't -- the
12 people of Millington don't want high-density
13 housing in the area. I mean, where have you
14 been?

15 CHAIRMAN HANDS: I think -- if you
16 --

17 MR. MOSCETTI: The other question
18 is: How are you going to do snow removal
19 there?

20 MR. FOURNIADIS: Going to hire a
21 snow removal contractor.

22 MR. MOSCETTI: Where are they going
23 to put it?

24 MR. FOURNIADIS: There's plenty of
25 green space on this property to put the snow.

1 MR. MOSCETTI: So you don't
2 understand people resenting being forced by
3 some law to allow you to come in and build 14
4 units with 10 units each as opposed to 14
5 single-family houses with large yards and that
6 sort of thing? You don't --

7 MR. FOURNIADIS: Of course I do. Of
8 course I do. But the concept of every
9 municipality having a constitutional
10 obligation to provide its fair share of
11 affordable housing has been the law of the
12 land since 1979 and it's just the way it is.
13 You're not the only municipality that has to
14 build inclusionary affordable housing
15 communities. There's 556 towns. They all
16 have to do it.

17 MR. MOSCETTI: So why don't you
18 just build the affordable housing units that
19 are required instead of gaining 15 percent?

20 MR. FOURNIADIS: What, build 21
21 affordable housing units? Why would I do
22 that? You can't make any -- that doesn't make
23 economic sense. The fact is I'm building what
24 the zoning says I can build. Not a unit --
25 single unit more than what the zoning says I

1 can build.

2 MR. MOSCETTI: I understand that.
3 But isn't there a point where you could have
4 30 percent affordable housing and still make a
5 profit, or 35 percent? You know, you're using
6 the mandate to your advantage where there
7 might be another calculation of --

8 MR. FOURNIADIS: I like to think I'm
9 using it to help the people that might be able
10 to afford to live here when they otherwise
11 wouldn't have been able to afford to live
12 here. That's how I look at it.

13 CHAIRMAN HANDS: And those
14 standards, the 15, 20 percent set-asides,
15 those are statute or whatever legal standards,
16 right? So you're adopting and adhering to
17 those standards.

18 MR. MOSCETTI: Does it say he can't
19 build 16 or 17?

20 CHAIRMAN HANDS: Geno, I think --
21 and I'll answer you, because there's
22 economic considerations, I would think, at
23 some point.

24 MR. MOSCETTI: Okay. Thank you.

25 CHAIRMAN HANDS: I see Bill there

1 coming up again.

2 Did you want to go to Bill?

3 COORDINATOR COONCE: Yep.

4 Bill, are you there?

5 MR. KAUFMAN: Yeah, sorry. I don't
6 mean to take any more time than necessary. I
7 just wanted to know -- I know that the
8 engineer submitted a revised plan and I just
9 wanted to know if we're going to hear from
10 Mr. Martell with respect to the revised plan
11 and if we'd be able to cross -- just ask a few
12 questions of Mr. Martell. That's all. Thank
13 you.

14 COORDINATOR COONCE: I think we said
15 that at the beginning.

16 Mr. Regan, did you mention you were
17 going to bring the engineer back?

18 MR. REGAN: Yes.

19 CHAIRMAN HANDS: That may be
20 tonight, do you think? Do you see him?

21 MR. REGAN: He's here.

22 MR. FOURNIADIS: He's here. As soon
23 as we're done with the questions for Angelo,
24 we'd like to bring him up.

25 CHAIRMAN HANDS: Perfect. Thank

1 you.

2 I see -- Bill, is that okay? Do you
3 want to hold your questions a little bit
4 longer?

5 MR. KAUFMAN: Yeah. I just have a
6 question for him. So that's -- that was the
7 basis of my question. Thank you.

8 CHAIRMAN HANDS: That's fine. Thank
9 you.

10 COORDINATOR COONCE: So then we have
11 Karen Meleta.

12 Karen, are you there?

13 MS. MELETA: Yes, I am. Am I
14 unmuted?

15 COORDINATOR COONCE: You are.

16 MS. MELETA: Okay. It's not an
17 architectural question, but just trying to
18 understand, what do you believe the market
19 rents for these are likely to be?

20 MR. FOURNIADIS: It's tough to say
21 right now where we are with -- with COVID.
22 Some people are saying rents are going to go
23 up because everybody's leaving the city;
24 Other people are saying rents are going to go
25 down because people are losing their jobs.

1 I'll tell you that our projections,
2 the last time they were updated, you know, six
3 months ago, before the pandemic, had the
4 two-bedrooms at about 2,400 square feet, the
5 three-bedrooms at 2,600 square feet, and
6 then of course the affordables are governed by
7 a formula dictated by the State and those
8 vary.

9 But, again, I can't commit to
10 that and I can't be held to it because
11 ultimately the market decides what rents we
12 can charge.

13 MS. MELETA: Any parameters or
14 range? Not holding you to it.

15 MR. REGAN: You said 2,400 square
16 feet, Bob. You meant \$2,400.

17 MR. FOURNIADIS: I'm sorry. \$2,400,
18 \$2,600. Thank you, Frank.

19 Yeah, that was our projection
20 pre-pandemic. At the rate we're going now,
21 the pandemic will be in the history books when
22 we pull our first building permit, so who
23 knows what the market will be like.

24 MS. MELETA: Thank you.

25 CHAIRMAN HANDS: Karen, was that

1 your question?

2 MS. MELETA: Yes.

3 CHAIRMAN HANDS: Appreciate it.

4 Thank you for that.

5 Deb, I don't see anybody else at
6 this point. If anybody has got their hand up
7 or thinks they have their hand up -- oh, Don.
8 Came and went.

9 COORDINATOR COONCE: He came and
10 went.

11 CHAIRMAN HANDS: Came and went.

12 Okay. Then if anybody --

13 COORDINATOR COONCE: Oh, there he --
14 he was. I'm going to see if I can find him.
15 Okay. Let me just allow him to talk.

16 Don?

17 MR. FARNELL: I'm here.

18 COORDINATOR COONCE: Okay. Did you
19 have some questions?

20 MR. FARNELL: Yes, I do. Thank you.

21 Mr. Angelo, can I ask you a couple
22 questions, please, regarding the documentation
23 prepared for the residential buildings?

24 THE WITNESS: Yes.

25 MR. FARNELL: The drawings you

1 showed tonight where you were showing the
2 trash, the receptacles and so forth, those
3 drawings were prepared by somebody other than
4 yourself, correct?

5 THE WITNESS: Yes.

6 MR. FARNELL: The -- through
7 earlier testimony, you also showed a very
8 detailed and dimensioned floor plan of the
9 units.

10 Did you prepare that or did somebody
11 else prepare that?

12 THE WITNESS: No, another firm
13 prepared that.

14 MR. FARNELL: Okay. Is the other
15 firm going to be testifying to the
16 residential buildings as documented and
17 submitted?

18 THE WITNESS: No. My earlier
19 testimony said that the building type that
20 they do our office also does. They did the
21 conceptual documents and we did the retail and
22 the clubhouse.

23 MR. FARNELL: Right.

24 THE WITNESS: You know, the
25 intention currently is, is that we were, you

1 know, able to testify on all three building
2 types and perhaps we get approvals and we
3 would document the three building types.

4 So that's why I've been testifying
5 that, you know, the dimensions are fairly
6 set, the building heights are set, the
7 elevations are set, but they're all
8 conceptual and they'll be detailed after
9 approval. And that's the way we do all of
10 these projects.

11 MR. FARNELL: Well, here's my
12 concern about the elevations for the
13 residential buildings. I've looked at these
14 things a number of times and I don't see any
15 dimension that illustrates the height of the
16 residential buildings. I know that you've
17 described the height, but in terms of
18 documentation submitted for approval, there's
19 no height shown on these buildings.

20 Don't you think that's a gross lack
21 of information?

22 THE WITNESS: I don't think it's --
23 the drawings are drawn to scale. I'm sitting
24 here looking at a scaled drawing that I have
25 next to me with all of the dimensions, you

1 know, and that's how I testify to the
2 dimensions. Perhaps it's an oversight and
3 those dimensions should have been on there,
4 but I will testify that the buildings will be
5 under 45 feet. And I could go over each floor
6 if you'd like.

7 MR. FARNELL: No, I don't -- I don't
8 want to go over each floor. But, I mean, I'm
9 assuming that as an architect and doing
10 residential stuff, multifamily residential,
11 that you have submitted building elevations
12 previously, correct?

13 THE WITNESS: Correct.

14 MR. FARNELL: Would you ever submit
15 a building elevation without a dimension
16 showing the height?

17 THE WITNESS: I would not want to do
18 that. Perhaps earlier in my career --

19 MR. FARNELL: So why is -- so why is
20 the documentation submitted now prepared by
21 others lacking pretty basic information that
22 people ought to know, wouldn't you think?

23 THE WITNESS: It would have
24 probably -- it would have been better if those
25 numbers were on there.

1 MR. FARNELL: Well, I would say so.
2 Now, I'd like to just follow up
3 with what I --

4 MR. REGAN: Mr. Farnell, if I might
5 interrupt. The plans that were submitted do
6 show dimensions for building height. I just
7 pulled out the plans.

8 MR. FARNELL: Could -- could
9 Mr. Alberto pull that up so I could see it?
10 Perhaps I missed it.

11 MR. REGAN: I don't know if you have
12 them. Do you have those, Angelo?

13 THE WITNESS: Can you see -- can you
14 folks see what's up here? Am I sharing my
15 screen?

16 MR. FARNELL: No. Not at the
17 moment.

18 THE WITNESS: Okay. Hold on.

19 These are the elevations that I have
20 in the package.

21 MR. FARNELL: Right. And I don't
22 see any dimensions showing height or typical
23 height to the first floor, second floor, to
24 the peak. There's no -- I don't see any
25 dimensions. Are we missing it?

1 THE WITNESS: Right.

2 And, Frank, is what you're looking
3 at, does that show heights?

4 MR. REGAN: Yeah. They're older
5 plans that I thought -- that I believe were
6 submitted. We'll have to confirm that.

7 MR. FARNELL: So there's really no
8 way for anybody who is uninitiated to know how
9 tall these residential buildings are.

10 MR. FOURNIADIS: No, that's not
11 true. He's testified under oath as to how
12 tall they are.

13 MR. FARNELL: I'm talking about
14 the buildings, Mr. Fourniadis, not his
15 testimony.

16 MR. REGAN: Well, but his testimony
17 is part of the record.

18 MR. FARNELL: So are the drawings.
19 This is -- so where are the dimensions to the
20 height -- for the height? Why -- why can't --
21 see, I got a real big problem that Devereaux
22 prepared these plans and they're being
23 submitted for approval without any testimony
24 from the individual who prepared them and they
25 don't even have a height on them. And you

1 want this Planning Board to approve this? I
2 think that's outrageous.

3 THE WITNESS: If the drawings are
4 drawn to scale, which they are --

5 MR. FARNELL: Mr. Angelo, I
6 understand that. Let us move on.

7 I think -- and I'm not speaking
8 for Chuck Arentowicz, but I think the point
9 he was trying to make when he was talking
10 about coming up Stone House Road, earlier in
11 the testimony, Mr. Martell -- and I asked
12 Mr. Martell a question regarding the relative
13 elevation of Building 6, the most southwestern
14 one on the site, in relationship to Stone
15 House Road. And I believe he said that the
16 finished floor elevation on the most
17 southwestern corner of Building 6 was 20 feet
18 above the elevation of Stone House Road.
19 Okay?

20 If the building -- now, Building
21 Number 6 is 45 feet high. The net effect of
22 the height of the top of that building
23 relative to Stone House Road is 65 feet.

24 Does that make sense? Mr. Angelo,
25 are you there?

1 THE WITNESS: Yeah. I believe it
2 makes sense. Again, I have not studied the
3 cross-section of the site.

4 MR. FARNELL: Okay. Let me ask a
5 question. If you were designing a six-story
6 building, how tall would it be?

7 THE WITNESS: If it was a flat roof?

8 MR. FARNELL: Yes.

9 THE WITNESS: Seventy to -- 70 to 80
10 feet.

11 MR. FARNELL: Okay. So how tall
12 would a five-story building be?

13 THE WITNESS: Fifty to 55 feet.

14 MR. FARNELL: Okay. So -- so the
15 net effect in the perception of Building
16 Number 6 from the street in its height on top
17 of the grading that we talked about to the
18 top of the roof is somewhere between a five-
19 and a six-story building height above Stone
20 House Road. Fair?

21 THE WITNESS: Fair.

22 MR. FARNELL: Okay. Okay. Now I'd
23 like to just move on, if we can, please, about
24 the retail building, if you could go back
25 there again.

1 THE WITNESS: Sure.

2 MR. FARNELL: Okay. Thank you.

3 Again, I like the revised drawing much better
4 myself.

5 I would like to say that in
6 Mr. Martell's testimony, and he was the site
7 engineer, the northeast corner of that
8 building is actually depressed 5 or 6 feet
9 below the elevation of Division Avenue. So
10 the image that is shown here does not
11 represent the relationship of that building to
12 Division Avenue because, in reality, it will
13 be very much depressed, the northern half of
14 that building.

15 THE WITNESS: Right.

16 MR. FARNELL: Okay? Okay.

17 The next thing I want to ask you
18 about is on your image on this -- on the
19 actual drawing that shows the side
20 elevation --

21 THE WITNESS: I just want to read
22 this point here. "Surrounding site paving,
23 lighting and landscape illustrated in the
24 above views are conceptual. Refer to civil
25 and landscape plans for site layout and

1 details."

2 So, again, we designed the
3 architecture, but we did not design it in
4 concert with -- you know, full concert -- I
5 mean, the setbacks and everything are
6 correct, but the landscaping and grades are
7 not completely illustrated. They're
8 conceptual.

9 MR. FARNELL: Okay. If you can just
10 scroll down a little bit to show us the end
11 elevation that you drew there on the same
12 drawing, please. The site elevation. Yes,
13 either one of those.

14 Okay. Those elevations aren't
15 correct either because they don't show the
16 dormers.

17 THE WITNESS: Yeah, that's a very
18 good point. The dormers are set back. They
19 should have been drawn in here and ghosted
20 out.

21 MR. FARNELL: Yeah.

22 THE WITNESS: That's --

23 MR. FARNELL: So -- so the
24 elevations are incorrect and the perspective
25 is incorrect.

1 THE WITNESS: Well, wait a second,
2 though. These -- the elevations -- this is
3 interesting because these are from the model.
4 This is -- this is a full 3-D model. So I'm
5 surprised that they're not showing. We build
6 the model -- in today's day and age, you build
7 the model and then you take snapshots. So --
8 but you're correct.

9 MR. FARNELL: My concern is that
10 you are representing these things as what
11 we're going to see and that's not really the
12 case.

13 THE WITNESS: Well, I would argue
14 that. I would argue that because in the
15 old days, you know, all you saw was this.
16 Okay? And you never see a building like
17 that, you know.

18 MR. FARNELL: You lost me.

19 THE WITNESS: So in the old days it
20 was plan section elevations. You saw a 2-D
21 elevation.

22 MR. FARNELL: Right.

23 THE WITNESS: And that's generally
24 how you saw buildings. You know, one of the
25 things that is a benefit of today's computers

1 and what we think is a benefit is that you're
2 seeing the actual -- you know, you're standing
3 at eye height here, you're looking up at this
4 building, and it is what you will see. I
5 would argue that it's more accurate than -- at
6 a conceptual level more accurate than just a
7 pure 2-D elevation.

8 MR. FOURNIADIS: Angelo, you can
9 redo this. I mean, the dormers are there.
10 We're not going to hide them.

11 THE WITNESS: No. Yeah, exactly.

12 MR. FOURNIADIS: So you can see what
13 it looks like from the side elevation. I
14 think in the top one you can just see the top
15 of the dormer just over the umbrella. I don't
16 know why it didn't show up on the other one.
17 But we're putting dormers in.

18 THE WITNESS: Right. Yeah. You can
19 just -- so if you look at this, it looks like
20 it's not a pure elevation. A person might be
21 a couple feet to the side and that's why
22 you're starting to see that. I don't know why
23 you're not seeing it in these ones. But they
24 are accurate. They're from a
25 three-dimensional building model.

1 MR. FOURNIADIS: But there will be
2 dormers.

3 MR. FARNELL: That's all I have,
4 Mr. Angelo. Thank you very much.

5 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

6 CHAIRMAN HANDS: Thank you, Don.
7 Appreciate it.

8 With that, I don't see anybody else,
9 Deb, unless you do.

10 COORDINATOR COONCE: Nope.

11 CHAIRMAN HANDS: So, Frank, I hand
12 it back. I think, my recollection, is we've
13 gone through all of your professionals and now
14 it's maybe going back on some points from the
15 past?

16 VICE CHAIRMAN JONES: Sorry,
17 Mr. Chair. Just monitoring the time.
18 Conscious of time.

19 CHAIRMAN HANDS: Oh, yes.

20 VICE CHAIRMAN JONES: Thank you.

21 MR. REGAN: With regards to -- yes.
22 I mean, in terms of the testimony of all our
23 professionals, you know, they've provided
24 their testimony. The last I wanted to bring
25 back was Jeff Martell just to have him go over

1 the revised plans that were submitted on
2 August 25th. Revisions to the site plan
3 specifically focusing on the banked parking,
4 landscaping and lighting, as well as the soil
5 movement exhibit, which I know has been
6 reviewed by the Board engineer.

7 MR. FARNELL: Hello. It's
8 unbelievable. It's unbelievable.

9 CHAIRMAN HANDS: Deb, do you want to
10 mute Don?

11 COORDINATOR COONCE: I did.

12 CHAIRMAN HANDS: Thank you.

13 MR. REGAN: Jeff, are you there?
14 You're muted.

15 CHAIRMAN HANDS: Frank, before you
16 continue, do you think -- just give a time
17 check, do you think, for Jeff's commentary.
18 Is that -- Jeff, I'll ask you, is this a long
19 commentary at this point?

20 MR. REGAN: I don't think so, Jeff,
21 right?

22 MR. MARTELL: Just a couple minutes.
23 Five minutes.

24 CHAIRMAN HANDS: And then, Michael,
25 you wanted to make a few notes as well from

1 your updated reports? Michael, are you there?
2 Can you hear me?

3 MR. LANZAFAMA: Yeah. Yeah, I had a
4 little trouble unmuting myself.

5 CHAIRMAN HANDS: That's okay.

6 MR. LANZAFAMA: Yeah. I reviewed
7 the plans. I have the report summary if
8 you'd like or I'd like Jeff to kind of just
9 run through the revisions and I could
10 comment.

11 CHAIRMAN HANDS: All right. Thank
12 you.

13 Jeff, back to you then, please.

14 VICE CHAIRMAN JONES: Sorry. Sorry,
15 Mr. Chair. You might want to just ask for the
16 participants to have a show of hands just so
17 you get an idea of the queuing up for
18 questions.

19 CHAIRMAN HANDS: I had none --

20 VICE CHAIRMAN JONES: I think one
21 gentleman, Mr. Kaufman, was going to have a
22 question.

23 CHAIRMAN HANDS: Excuse me. You're
24 a hundred percent correct. Yeah, there he is.

25 So why don't we just go this route

1 first just so we get the testimony on record
2 and see where we end up in maybe ten minutes.

3 MR. REGAN: Jeff, you can proceed
4 with just giving the Board a brief summary of
5 the revised plans as well as the soil movement
6 exhibit that was submitted.

7 MS. MAZIARZ: Yeah. Mr. Martell,
8 you were sworn previously, correct?

9 J E F F R E Y M A R T E L L,
10 having been previously duly sworn, remained
11 under oath and testified as follows:

12 THE WITNESS: Yes, correct.

13 MS. MAZIARZ: You understand and
14 acknowledge that you're still under oath?

15 THE WITNESS: Yes, correct.

16 MS. MAZIARZ: Thank you.

17 MR. REGAN: Go ahead, Jeff.

18 MR. MARTELL: Good evening. Since
19 the last time I testified, I think we had made
20 two submissions. But since the last time my
21 colleagues testified in regards to traffic and
22 my landscape architecture, we made a
23 submission on August 25th that was meant to
24 address a number of the items that we had
25 agreed to in prior meetings.

1 So with that said, I'll quickly
2 summarize.

3 On the landscaping front, we added a
4 total of 47 trees in order to meet the total
5 number of tree plantings required at the
6 property. A lot of the plantings were added
7 around the perimeter of the site as noted
8 earlier this evening. A number of the
9 plantings are proposed now between the
10 buildings closest to Division Avenue and the
11 Division Avenue roadway itself. There's also
12 a number of internal plantings within internal
13 islands on the site.

14 There is a note in the Board
15 engineer's letter about a conversation that we
16 had that we are agreeable to adjusting the
17 species to appease the Board engineer's
18 comments, which I think is consistent with the
19 spirit of the ordinance to provide a wide
20 variety of species. So we're agreeable to
21 making adjustments on the species. However, I
22 think now we've presented a plan that's
23 conforming relative to the total number of
24 tree plantings as required.

25 We submitted an earthwork exhibit

1 that the Board asked our office to prepare.
2 The site is a net fill. As we discussed
3 earlier in testimony, there's approximately a
4 40-foot grade change across the property from
5 one end of the site to the other. Very
6 difficult to design a safe property with
7 that much of a grade change.

8 So what we generally have is
9 somewhat of a plateau in the center of the
10 site for safe grading and enjoyable living
11 spaces around the buildings and we make up a
12 majority of the grading around the perimeter
13 of the site. Most notably that tiered wall
14 area to the southwest corner.

15 We expect approximately three to
16 four months to accomplish the majority of the
17 soil movement on site given the scale of the
18 property and the amount of earthwork that is
19 required as part of this.

20 There was a request in the Board
21 engineer's letter -- or a question, I should
22 say, whether a source of that fill material
23 has been identified. It has not. But the
24 applicant is agreeable to providing
25 documentation of any imported soil as a

1 condition of approval.

2 We revised the lighting plan. I
3 think we made a couple of good changes,
4 predominantly as a result of looking at the
5 Board engineer's comments. We reduced the
6 average lighting on the property from 2.3
7 footcandles to 1.7 footcandles. And I think,
8 more notably, we've improved what's called the
9 uniformity ratio from 11.67 to 3.67. The
10 ordinance requires 4. So we're essentially
11 bringing it within conformance of the lighting
12 uniformity ratio on the property.

13 I would also note there is a note in
14 the Board engineer's letter about whether the
15 applicant would be agreeable to dimming the
16 lighting in the nighttime hours. The
17 applicant is agreeable. Obviously we want to
18 maintain a safe property for the future
19 residents and community. However, at the
20 Board engineer's discretion, and in
21 conjunction with the applicant, we are
22 agreeable to dimming the lighting in those
23 nighttime hours.

24 We've added a sidewalk near Building
25 8, which is the southeast corner closet to the

1 Country Farms, out to the sidewalk along
2 Division Avenue. There was a comment about
3 whether if somebody wanted to walk south on
4 Division, would they have to go all the way
5 north on the site to essentially exit and then
6 come back south? I thought that was a good
7 comment so we added that sidewalk. We also
8 smoothed out the sidewalk in front of the
9 retail building.

10 There was also a comment about how
11 we had kind of abrupt changes in direction,
12 so we made that more of a natural sidewalk
13 with just a curvilinear shape to get around
14 some utility poles and such.

15 And then, lastly, my colleague,
16 Mr. Seckler, the traffic engineer, had
17 presented a revised parking plan that included
18 banked parking. That plan had also
19 reallocated some of the ADA parking spaces on
20 the site and then had also added a handful of
21 parking spaces. But as part of his testimony,
22 he had testified to a number of banked parking
23 spaces that could be provided in the event
24 that the appropriate parties deem that
25 additional parking would be necessary. The

1 parallel parking spaces near Buildings 2 and 3
2 could be converted to typical 90-degree
3 parking spaces.

4 I believe the Board asked to just
5 understand the engineering behind that. So
6 what we've done on the applicable sheets
7 within the site plan set is we provided an
8 inset on the site plan and grading plan, et
9 cetera, to essentially show that future
10 parking banked condition.

11 For purposes of the testimony, I
12 would like to state that we are still under
13 the allowable impervious coverage. There's no
14 variance created with that additional
15 coverage. There's no stormwater management
16 changes that would be required, no utility
17 changes that would be required, and no
18 lighting changes that would be required. So
19 essentially the design would accommodate
20 either the parallel parking space condition or
21 the 90-degree parking situation in the event
22 the banked parking spaces were to be
23 constructed.

24 What the insets show is the changes
25 to the curb, pavement, and localized changes

1 to landscaping and grading.

2 With that said, I had a couple of
3 affirmative statements I could make relative
4 to the Board engineer's letter or we could
5 defer that to a comprehensive summary,
6 whatever the Board prefers.

7 CHAIRMAN HANDS: Mike, can you pick
8 it up from there?

9 MR. LANZAFAMA: Certainly. Jeff
10 pretty much accurately described what the
11 modifications to the plan were. The key for
12 us was the additional landscaping, the
13 modifications to the lighting, and the ability
14 to provide additional parking if the need
15 should arise.

16 They did improve the parking layout
17 to allow for more parking on the southern end
18 of the site and they did a much better
19 distribution of the handicap parking
20 throughout the facility.

21 The concept of the banked parking I
22 think is a win-win for both the Board and the
23 applicant. The only trigger there is at what
24 point do we put that in? Or the only question
25 is at what point do we put that in? And I

1 think that's self-policing. If the landlord
2 realizes he does not have enough parking for
3 his tenants, he's going to implement that and
4 he's going to put it in.

5 So with that in mind, and the fact
6 that we're still under the total impervious
7 coverage, I think the plan has been
8 approved -- improved quite a bit. And that
9 the additional landscaping along Division
10 Avenue mitigates the fact that we have
11 added some additional parking, perpendicular
12 parking, adjacent to Buildings 10 and 12.

13 So Jeff has agreed to work with us
14 on dimming of the lights and reworking some of
15 the species to better conform to the
16 application -- to the ordinance requirements.

17 The -- they still require a waiver
18 on the lighting. There are two waivers I
19 believe they need. The ordinance requires
20 that light fixtures have lumen levels of no
21 more than 4,000 lumens. Some of the light
22 fixtures that they're proposing are greater in
23 the amount of lumens. I think they go up to
24 6,500. But in my mind, the ordinance that we
25 have is very, very difficult to meet and

1 provide a good uniform lighting level.

2 I think what they've produced is
3 really what the ordinance intended: To get a
4 nice even, more uniform lighting level. The
5 less than 4 to 1 ratio on lighting is really
6 almost an ideal scenario.

7 And, also, the fact that under the
8 ordinance we're not allowed to have
9 footcandle levels of greater than .2
10 overnight. That may not be the best scenario
11 in this type of development. You do want to
12 have adequate lighting for security reasons.
13 Their lighting level I believe is going to be
14 1.95. But as Jeff indicated, what's great
15 about the LED light fixtures is they can be
16 put on dimmers. So that they can get that
17 lighting level down a bit, maybe closer to
18 1, during the evening hours, overnight
19 hours.

20 So all in all, I think the plan is
21 definitely in the right place. I think
22 they've made enough adjustments on the
23 lighting and the landscaping to satisfy our
24 office.

25 CHAIRMAN HANDS: Jeff, did you want

1 to add any more comments? I think you said
2 you had a couple things you may want to add,
3 or was that completed, your --

4 THE WITNESS: They're really
5 details. Really details. You know, I can go
6 through them really quick for the purposes of
7 the Board. I can go over a couple of the open
8 items in the letter.

9 There's an updated survey from March
10 of 2019. Signed and sealed copies can be
11 provided. I think we have provided older
12 copies.

13 There was a note about
14 recommendation for concrete flushed curb on
15 the ADA route, which we show on the detail,
16 but the site plan labels block curb around the
17 balance of the site. We agree with the
18 recommendation on the concrete curb. It's a
19 safer condition for an ADA route.

20 We would note any details associated
21 with the pool, the patios. We agree to submit
22 as part of construction plans for the Board
23 engineer's approval prior to construction.
24 Any spot grades required by the Board engineer
25 or the building inspector will be provided for

1 ADA areas.

2 Previously agreed to a downstream
3 sanitary sewer study. We would provide any
4 copies of outside agencies and utility
5 profiles. And similar to the pool, we've
6 provided detail for the retaining walls as
7 part of construction documents.

8 And with that said, I just put those
9 items on the record as they were items noted
10 in the letter.

11 MR. REGAN: Thank you, Jeff.

12 CHAIRMAN HANDS: Michael, anything
13 you wanted to add on that, or are you
14 comfortable with --

15 MR. LANZAFAMA: No. I was happy
16 to hear that he's willing to comply with
17 the other open items. There's nothing
18 else.

19 You know, the one issue that we
20 really haven't explored in depth is the
21 earthwork analysis and the amount of fill
22 being brought into the site. I raised a
23 couple of questions with regard to source.
24 And the reason I ask about the source is
25 because we really at some point, prior to

1 actually implementing this plan, is perhaps
2 identify the trucking route that's going to be
3 taken to and from the site. That's why I
4 asked about the source.

5 And in your analysis, Jeff, you've
6 only taken into account, I think, about 2,000
7 yards of material from demolition. And I'm
8 wondering if you couldn't use more of the
9 demolition material, recycle the concrete.
10 You do have large fills in the southwest
11 corner. Maybe by utilizing more of recycled
12 materials, we can help reduce the amount of
13 trucking into the site.

14 THE WITNESS: Yeah, I agree a
15 hundred percent. The applicant intends to do
16 that. Honestly questioned me on that same
17 line of questioning.

18 You know, my representation to
19 the Board, I think, with the earthwork was
20 there is probably a little bit high, but I say
21 that in that I think it's a conservative
22 number and that there's definitely value
23 engineering and recycling of materials that
24 could happen on site which would only reduce
25 that number.

1 So from a Planning Board
2 presentation, you know, the applicant's team
3 agreed to submit what we'll call a
4 conservative number. And really with
5 engineering in mind as well as, you know,
6 reduction of any import, there are likely some
7 efficiencies that can happen during
8 construction.

9 So we can kind of call that a
10 ceiling number, so to speak, and in real
11 life, it will probably be less, which I
12 think would just be less of a change, so to
13 speak, in terms of soil going on and off the
14 site.

15 MR. LANZAFAMA: So as part of moving
16 forward and the implementation of the plan, is
17 it appropriate, then, to have a condition,
18 Mr. Chairman, that they at some point submit a
19 trucking route to the Board, either to the
20 Board or to the municipal engineer and the
21 police department, so that they can monitor
22 the trucking to and from the site? You're
23 talking about quite a few trucks over a three-
24 or four-month period.

25 MR. REGAN: Yeah, I don't think --

1 we have no problem with that, right, Bob?

2 MR. FOURNIADIS: Yeah, that's fine.

3 MR. LANZAFAMA: Thank you. That's
4 all I have.

5 CHAIRMAN HANDS: Noticing it's
6 10:30, we do have some questions, some hands
7 up. Can we just at least go to 10:45?

8 MAYOR RAE: David, do we really need
9 to? I don't know what it's going to -- we're
10 going to another meeting anyway.

11 CHAIRMAN HANDS: Yeah. I do have
12 one -- let me ask one quick question of
13 Jeffrey. I missed a note on conditional
14 approval, what we just discussed.

15 Earlier you were talking about soil
16 before you went on to lights and you mentioned
17 something else that was a condition of
18 approval.

19 THE WITNESS: Oh, I think I said --
20 in terms of soil, I said that we could
21 provide documentation to any soil that's
22 imported.

23 MR. LANZAFAMA: Well, you have to,
24 yeah.

25 CHAIRMAN HANDS: Okay.

1 MR. LANZAFAMA: They have to do
2 that. They have to demonstrate that it's
3 clean material coming in.

4 MR. FOURNIADIS: Right.

5 CHAIRMAN HANDS: Okay. Thank you.

6 With that said, it's 10:30. What's
7 the Board's pleasure?

8 COORDINATOR COONCE: Mr. Chairman,
9 I could make a note of the three
10 individuals: Mr. Kaufman, Ms. Berquist and
11 Mr. Arentowicz, they would go in that order
12 starting at our next meeting for the
13 engineer.

14 CHAIRMAN HANDS: That would be great
15 if everybody -- Dennis, what would you like to
16 say?

17 COORDINATOR COONCE: You have to
18 unmute, Dennis.

19 BOARD MEMBER SANDOW: I was just
20 raising my hand because I also have a few
21 questions for the engineer, probably about ten
22 minutes' worth.

23 CHAIRMAN HANDS: All right. So
24 let's hold that to the next meeting.

25 Frank, where do we stand now in

1 terms of your presentation? Is it these last
2 few questions of the engineer? Do you have
3 anything else until we turn it over to public
4 comments?

5 MR. REGAN: I don't believe we had.
6 I believe this will conclude our direct
7 testimony.

8 CHAIRMAN HANDS: Okay. And then
9 just help me understand quickly, are there any
10 other documents that are going to be uploaded
11 or need to be modified? The scale issue
12 concern. I'm not sure if you're going to make
13 changes to some of the documents to include a
14 scale.

15 Are there any more documents you
16 propose to submit before the public has time
17 to comment?

18 MR. REGAN: With regards to
19 architectural plans, we may do that. We
20 have to discuss that, whether that can be
21 done before the next meeting, to provide
22 some add --

23 MR. FOURNIADIS: If we have enough
24 time. It's just a question -- I've already
25 sent an e-mail to Mr. Alberto; I don't know if

1 he's still on -- to look at the scale, which I
2 know he did before he testified, under oath,
3 as to the height of the building, and then add
4 the details to the plans and submit them so
5 it's on the record.

6 CHAIRMAN HANDS: That would be great
7 to do. And are there any other plans,
8 anything else you have in your mind that we
9 need to update to be submitted?

10 MR. REGAN: No, that would be it.

11 MR. FOURNIADIS: That's it. Defense
12 rests.

13 CHAIRMAN HANDS: So with that all
14 said, we'll skip over the rest of the agenda
15 for tonight if that's okay unless anybody has
16 anything pressing, Deb, from anybody, township
17 committee? Nothing.

18 Deb, we still do need to organize a
19 couple of meetings on a couple of those
20 committees. We've got that still, right?

21 COORDINATOR COONCE: Yes.

22 CHAIRMAN HANDS: Okay.

23 COORDINATOR COONCE: Yep. I'm on
24 it.

25 CHAIRMAN HANDS: With that, we'll go

1 to the three hands up for next meeting:
2 Christina, Chuck and Bill.

3 VICE CHAIRMAN JONES: And add
4 Mr. Kaufman. I think he put his hand up.

5 CHAIRMAN HANDS: Yeah.

6 COORDINATOR COONCE: I did. I have
7 them in order as Mr. Kaufman starting, then
8 Ms. Berquist, and then Mr. Arentowicz.

9 VICE CHAIRMAN JONES: Thank you.
10 Do we need to do anything -- sorry.
11 Do we need to do anything special about
12 notification?

13 COORDINATOR COONCE: We need to --
14 first we need to --

15 MS. MAZIARZ: I was just going to
16 ask.

17 COORDINATOR COONCE: Yep. We need
18 to have an extension, Mr. Regan, through
19 October.

20 MR. REGAN: Yes. I will provide
21 you -- we agree to an extension through the
22 end of October and I will get you a letter
23 tomorrow to that effect.

24 COORDINATOR COONCE: Great. And
25 then, further, the next Planning Board meeting

1 we will carry to, upon motion, would be
2 October 13th. So the Board needs to make a
3 motion and second to carry the application
4 with no further notice required by the
5 applicant.

6 VICE CHAIRMAN JONES: So moved.

7 BOARD MEMBER PFEIL: Second.

8 CHAIRMAN HANDS: Thank you, Alan.

9 COORDINATOR COONCE: All in favor?

10 (Whereupon, a voice vote was taken;
11 chorus of "ayes" heard.)

12 COORDINATOR COONCE: Any opposed?

13 Great.

14 CHAIRMAN HANDS: Any other business
15 that we have to address for the application or
16 any other business at all at this point? Are
17 we good?

18 All right. Motion to adjourn for
19 tonight.

20 MAYOR RAE: So moved.

21 CHAIRMAN HANDS: Second?

22 BOARD MEMBER VERLEZZA: Second.

23 COORDINATOR COONCE: All in favor?

24 (Whereupon, a voice vote was taken;
25 chorus of "ayes" heard.)

1 CHAIRMAN HANDS: Thank you, all.

2 COORDINATOR COONCE: Thank you.

3 Have a good evening.

4 MR. REGAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

5 MR. FOURNIADIS: Good night,

6 everybody.

7 (Whereupon, the hearing on this
8 application was adjourned at 10:35 p.m. to
9 October 13, 2020, at 7:30 p.m.)

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, BRIDGET LOMBARDOZZI, Notary Public
and Certified Shorthand Reporter of the State
of New Jersey, do hereby certify that the
foregoing is a true and accurate transcript of
the testimony as taken stenographically by and
before me at the time, place and the date
hereinbefore set forth.

I DO FURTHER CERTIFY that I am neither
a relative nor employee nor attorney nor
counsel of any of the parties to this action,
and that I am neither a relative nor employee
of such attorney or counsel, and that I am not
financially interested in the action.

BRIDGET LOMBARDOZZI,
Certified Shorthand Reporter
C.S.R. License No. XI01201